

BOYCE THOMPSON INSTITUTE

POLICY: POST-TENURE REVIEW – Faculty/Scientist

DATE: October 10, 2001

OVERVIEW

The Boyce Thompson Institute expects tenured faculty to maintain a research program that is consistently well funded, demonstrates productivity through peer-reviewed publications, and is highly recognized within the faculty's discipline. Contributions to the scientific community, the Institute, and Cornell are important criteria, but secondary to those directly related to research.

If during the annual review a tenured faculty member receives evaluations of unsatisfactory in two consecutive years, a formal post-tenure review is triggered. The post-tenure review helps the scientist re-establish his or her research program and ultimately helps determine whether the scientist continues to serve at the Institute, or is required to leave.

Role of the Research Oversight Committee (ROC)

The ROC will be notified if a faculty member receives an "unsatisfactory" rating. The ROC will enter into a discussion with the VP for Research, representing the Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC), and the President, prior to the annual evaluation rating being assigned in the **following year**. If it is determined that performance is still "unsatisfactory," a post-tenure review will be triggered.

Role of the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee

The PTR committee is constituted by the President and is comprised of the Vice President for Research, one tenured Institute scientist, two members of the ROC and one peer scientist from outside the Institute. The committee will convene twice to review the performance of the faculty member. The first meeting will be approximately six months after the triggering annual review. The committee's charge at this meeting will be to conduct an in-depth assessment of the scientist's performance, and review/critique the scientist's two-year plan for scientific and professional development.

The materials provided to the post-tenure review committee will include the following:

- **Annual Reviews:** Copies of the annual performance reviews for the last six years.

- **Faculty Letters:** Each tenured faculty member at the Institute will provide a letter evaluating the scientist in respect to the three primary criteria of funding, publications, and professional standing, and the secondary criteria of service to the Institute and the scientific community. The letter will conclude with an opinion as to whether the performance criteria are being satisfied. Each tenured faculty member should receive a copy of the scientist's resume (see below) to facilitate this effort.
- **Resume:** The candidate will provide a resume prepared using the format delineated in the Review for Promotion procedure.

The scientist being reviewed prepares a seminar-style presentation on his/her research and a detailed two-year performance improvement/development plan. The performance improvement plan should include plans for publications, proposal writing, major research initiatives and any plans for retraining, sabbatical, etc. The scientist may also provide an overview from his/her perspective of the reason(s) for unsatisfactory performance and how he/she believes it can be remedied.

The PTR committee meets with the scientist to hear his/her presentation, to discuss the performance concerns and to review his/her performance improvement plan. After the meeting, the committee prepares a written report for the President summarizing performance, evaluating research potential and identifying research directions the scientist could consider. The report may also include suggested additions or modifications to the scientist's development plan.

Second Meeting of PTR

The second PTR meeting takes place two years after the first PTR committee meeting to review performance since the initial meeting. The committee may, but is not obligated to, solicit letters of evaluation from scientists outside the Institute, and will have access to the interim annual evaluation and updated resume. The committee may choose to meet with the scientist to obtain additional information. The committee prepares a report for the President that summarizes performance during the two-year period, with particular emphasis on accomplishments and progress associated with the development plan, and persistent performance issues. The report concludes with a final performance rating: "meets expectations", "continues to need improvement", or "remains unsatisfactory."

President's Decision

The President having considered the assessment and evaluation of the PTR, will make a final determination of performance rating. If the scientist is meeting expectations, he/she will continue his/her research and subsequently be evaluated in the standard annual review process. If the scientist continues to

need improvement, he/she will construct a development plan for the next year, which will be critiqued and reviewed by the President. At the end of that year, the President will evaluate the scientist's performance. If the scientist is meeting expectations, he/she will continue his/her research and subsequently be evaluated in the standard annual review process. If the President finds the scientist's performance to be unsatisfactory, the President will immediately initiate administrative action. Administrative action may include reassignment of responsibilities, reduction in office and lab space, reduction in salary, dismissal from the Institute, or other steps as determined by the President. All administrative action will be reviewed by Human Resources prior to implementation to ensure proper documentation and legal compliance.

Documentation of Process

The faculty member's two-year plan and the President's summary and determination will be maintained in the faculty member's personnel file. Documents confidential to the faculty member, i.e., letters from other faculty members and recommendations of the PTR committee should be maintained separately in the Human Resources Office.