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The faculty at NJMS are now considering implementing a post-tenure review system which has been under consideration by various NJMS bodies for over two and half years. **A major impetus to the Faculty Organization’s (FO) development of a PTR was that there is a distinct advantage to the faculty to have the system designed and administered by faculty.** This preamble gives a brief history of the genesis of this document:

- **May 28, 2009** A PTR subcommittee, composed of three tenured professors, one of whom is a Department Chair, is formed and announced at FO meeting. Liz Raveche Chair, Roger Howell and Mike Matthews members.

- **August 2009** The PTR subcommittee looks at PTR at other institutions and drafts a PTR for NJMS. PTR was examined at 2 medical schools; at Rutgers; at the University of MD; in the report of the VA lawmakers (who indirectly looked at 6 institutions granting doctoral degrees in VA); and in AAUP resources. The PTR committee also reviewed the UMDNJ and NJMS Bylaws and the AAUP contract. After months of deliberation a report is sent to the FO officers.

- **Nov 2009** A DRAFT PTR report is presented to FO officers.

- **July 2010** Revised DRAFT PTR sent to FO officers and PTR distributed to all faculty by email. PTR guidelines also discussed with Department Chairs.

- **Sept 7, 2010** FO Meeting has presentation by PTR committee. A vote to continue post-tenure review consideration with additional comments solicited from faculty passes (22 for, 5 against, 1 abstention).

- **Nov 16, 2010** A second presentation is made to the Faculty Organization at large. A motion is made to further consider PTR and elicit faculty comments via UMDNJ portal . A short audience response to issues in PTR is conducted. With regard to a ten year interval for PTR (11 Yes, 7 No), have the PTR packet first go to FCAP (13 Yes, 6 No), PTR final vote by Faculty Affairs (10 Yes, 4 No), potential outcomes including reducing effort, undergoing development plant (14 Yes, 5 No). The PTR is presented to the NJMS AAUP for comment as well.

- **Feb 9, 2011** The document is placed on FO website and on the UMDNJ portal in the FO Group for threaded discussion and an email sent to all faculty.

- **Nov 2011- Feb 2012** FO officers and PTR taskforce work to incorporate changes suggested by faculty and modify and improve PTR document.

- **Feb 2012-present** FO officers meet with Dean to discuss aspects of PTR including financial support for the post-tenure development plans.
As a background, the original PTR taskforce discussed issues concerning tenure and considered some of the pros and cons of tenure. Reasons that have been given for having a tenure system include: (1) tenure is part of the NJMS faculty system and is embedded in our academic practice and culture; (2) tenure protects academic freedom; (3) tenure has economic implications and protects individuals who accepted lower salary for more job security; (4) tenure enhances an institution’s ability to fulfill its missions of research/scholarship and service and helps recruit and retain outstanding faculty. Departure from the tenure system could result in a competitive disadvantage when trying to hire and retain faculty. With tenure, individuals may be more willing to pursue research, scholarship and education in areas that may eventually have long-term benefits, but are less likely to have an immediate or near-term benefit. Reasons that have been given for doubting the value of the tenure system include: (1) tenure entrenches less productive faculty; (2) tenure insulates faculty from accountability and economic and other realities; (3) tenure limits institutional flexibility and staffing decisions; (4) tenure denies incentives for research, teaching, and service; (5) the process for tenure and post-tenure review takes too much faculty time.

In addition, the UMDNJ bylaws and the NJMS bylaws indirectly support a review system. Both the UMDNJ and NJMS Bylaws have a section entitled OBLIGATION OF THE FACULTY Article IV Title F, Section 5 of current NJMS Bylaws: “Faculty members who are granted tenure are expected to sustain their accomplishment and contributions to the teaching, research and, where applicable, clinical and service programs of the University and to their area(s) of expertise throughout the duration of the tenure appointment”. Upon review of past bylaws the section “OBLIGATION OF THE FACULTY” came into existence sometime around 2000.

The PTR subcommittee in drafting a PTR discussed elements of a PTR system which would be critical for a fair and beneficial system must use the primary criteria on which tenure decisions were originally based: education, research and scholarship, and service. For clinicians there may be an additional patient care category. An effective post-tenure review policy must involve a review of all of these areas and tenured faculty are expected to maintain excellence in all categories, however, the weight of each of the categories varies depending upon the job expectations of the particular faculty member. PTR should be integrated with the regular faculty evaluation policy; it should be developmental in nature so that a tenured faculty member who is not performing at the desired level has the opportunity to develop goals and a plan to meet the expectations; and it should include a timetable to achieve the mutually agreed-upon goals. The review should be systematic and uniformly applied, provide for due process, and be connected to the existing means available to faculty to redress grievances.

Since the original drafting of the PTR in 2009, the issue of PTR, especially in medical schools, has continued to evolve. In 2007, in a report in Academic Medicine, 54% of nationwide public medical schools had some form of PTR (this was lower in the northeast region). As recently as 2011, the University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill) School of Medicine adopted PTR in a form very similar to the PTR drafted by the NJMS PTR subcommittee. In the media, there have been articles about the recent PTR plan which has been imposed by the Board of Regents in all 15 campuses (including medical schools) in the University of Texas System. The Faculty Council at several campuses of the UT system have opposed this because of lack of faculty involvement in this process. Finally, a ten year evaluation of PTR at the University of Louisville School of Medicine
found an overall favorable outcome with 95% of the faculty receiving satisfactory PTR; among the remaining faculty, some underwent voluntary loss of tenure or retirement and other faculty, following the PTR based development plan, were invigorated and in many cases had a successful outcome. All these factors were taken into account in drafting this PTR.

Respectfully submitted, Liz Raveche
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In this article an official of the Texas Public Policy Foundation, which helped shape the governor’s (Texas) pronouncements in 2008, praised the proposal. "It increases the accountability universities have to demonstrate to taxpayers that their money’s being spent productively,” said Thomas Lindsay, director of the foundation’s Center for Higher Education. "I think it’s pretty unobjectionable ... unless we believe faculty are alone among human beings in requiring no incentives to do their job."
Post-tenure review at the University Of Louisville School Of Medicine: a faculty development and revitalization tool.  

Abstract  
In 1994, the University of Louisville board of trustees mandated that each school develop a methodology for post-tenure review. Ten years after implementation, this article provides an update on the process and its outcomes. In the case of an unsatisfactory evaluation, a faculty member is re-reviewed two years later. Failed reviews trigger the creation of a faculty development plan. The plan includes specific and measurable requirements to be met within one year, with an additional year to demonstrate success. The plan must clearly state objective goals related to the area of deficiency, development activities that the faculty member will engage in, and resources the institution will provide for the faculty member to achieve the stated goals. Soon after implementation, an increase in retirement rates was observed. Since then, more than 250 post-tenure reviews have been completed in the school of medicine, and over 95% of faculty reviewed received ratings of satisfactory. Outcomes for faculty receiving ratings of unsatisfactory vary. Overall, results suggest that post-tenure review at the University of Louisville School of Medicine has facilitated faculty revitalization not only for those who failed, but also for others as they prepare for the evaluation process. The key to the success of this program is its nonpunitive nature. The focus on faculty development and the resulting reinvigoration of the careers of faculty put a positive spin on what otherwise would have been perceived as a top-down measure to increase faculty accountability.