

Procedural Guidelines

Carver College of Medicine Five Year Peer Review Process

As per the University of Iowa's Policy on Review of Tenured Faculty Members (III-10.7) the Carver College of Medicine shall conduct five year peer review of tenured faculty members. This five year review process is considered to be both formative and summative, with the desire for acknowledgment of goals achieved and expectations for continued growth. Faculty members are exempted from their scheduled five year review if (a) they are being reviewed for promotion to a higher rank during the year of the scheduled review (b) they are within one year of announced retirement or are on phased retirement or (c) they serve as DEO, Assistant Dean, Associate Dean or Dean.

Procedural Guidelines:

1. Each department shall develop and disseminate standards of performance for tenured faculty members in their unit.
2. Each department shall designate a committee of no less than three (3) individuals at or above the rank of those being reviewed. The promotion and tenure committee in the department may serve in this capacity. DEOs and other academic administrators may not serve on peer review committees.
3. The membership of this committee shall be made known to the department. Should a faculty member object to any member of the review committee, a written statement should be given to the DEO, with reasons for the objection.
4. If a department does not have the appropriate number of faculty at the appropriate rank individuals from other relevant departments within the college may be asked to serve in this capacity. Approval for external additions to this committee should be requested from the Associate Dean for Faculty. In addition, departments may choose to invite external consultants with specific expertise to provide confidential faculty review to the DEO.
5. Materials required for the review shall be submitted to the department no later than September 1 of the academic year in which the review is to occur.
6. Materials to be submitted by the faculty member undergoing review include but are not limited to:
 - a. An updated CV in the College of Medicine format
 - b. A personal statement (limit three pages) outlining accomplishments over the preceding five (5) years in the three areas of academic performance: teaching, research and service. If the faculty member has clinical activities, accomplishments in that arena should also be included.
 - c. A statement regarding future plans (limit one page total) in each of the areas noted above, as appropriate.
 - d. Copies of manuscripts over the preceding five (5) years, if applicable
 - e. Copies of teaching materials from the last five (5) years (e.g . syllabi; power point presentations, etc)
 - f. Copies of teaching evaluations from the last five (5) years

- g. Copies of grant reviews for recent new submissions/renewals, as appropriate
7. Materials to be reviewed by the Peer Review Committee include but are not limited to:
 - a. Materials submitted by the faculty (see above)
 - b. Materials that may be held centrally that are appropriate for the committee to review (e. g. teaching evaluations, evaluation of clinical performance)
 - c. Annual reviews, if such exist
 - d. Previous peer reviews, if such exists
8. The peer review committee is expected to develop a report based on its review. This report should be completed no later than February 1 of the review year. This report is to be submitted to the DEO for review.
9. Simultaneously, the report is provided to the faculty member for review and comment. The faculty member has ten (10) calendar days to respond to the review to correct factual errors or to rebut the findings of the committee.
10. If no further action is required the report is placed in the faculty member's personnel file, along with any responses received from the faculty member. The outcome of the peer review is confidential and confined to the faculty member, the review committee, the DEO, the Dean, others directed by the faculty member and, in special circumstances, the Provost.

In the event the committee determines that the reviewed faculty performance is below the standards set by the department:

1. The committee shall communicate those concerns to the DEO through its written review.
2. The Dean or his/her designee and the DEO shall develop a written development plan for the faculty member based on the individualized faculty portfolio and taking into consideration the performance standards of the department. This written plan shall include a timetable for evaluation of acceptable progress as well as potential consequences for not meeting expectations in the timeline set forth.
3. Progress towards these goals shall be monitored through the Annual Review process, with written feedback regarding progress provided to the faculty member.
4. If the plan is not acceptable to the faculty member, s/he shall provide a written justification for not agreeing to the plan within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of the plan.
5. The plan and the faculty member's justification for inability to accept the plan shall be presented to the Provost, who will make the final determination.
6. If the faculty member believes that there are grounds for grievance, then the faculty member may seek redress of the grievance within the scope and framework of the Faculty Dispute Procedures (III-29.6).

Approved by the faculty November 15, 2011

Approved by the Provost November 20, 2011