

School of Medicine
Bylaws Revisions Summary

No.	Page	Section	Current/Proposed Language	Rationale
1	2	II.	Delete space before period	Clerical.
2	5	III.C.1.c.	<p>Current: “Quorum: 11. Decisions are made by a simple majority of those voting.”</p> <p>Proposed: “Quorum: No less than a simple majority of all members eligible to vote⁴ is required to approve a motion.”</p> <p>“⁴Eligible to vote refers to the total number of members on the committee, less the non-voting members.”</p>	The proposed change would make the voting rules for the Admissions Committee identical to those of the Councils. It would also impose a higher standard for admission decisions and approval on other matters (i.e. majority of <u>eligible</u> voting members as opposed to a majority of those present).
3	5	III.C.2.a.	<p>Current: “The SAPC shall manage the peer review process to consider awards of tenure and promotion to senior rank on academic grounds, except for department chairs. In conjunction with Department Chairs, the SAPC shall review and approve or deny applications to interrupt progression to tenure. (See Appendix B.) The SAPC shall also manage the post-tenure review process (See Appendix C.)”</p> <p>Proposed: “The SAPC shall manage the peer review process to consider awards of tenure and promotion to senior rank on academic grounds, except for department chairs. The SAPC shall also manage the post-tenure review process (See Appendix C.)”</p>	In regard to requests for extending the tenure probationary period, the SAPC noted that if they were involved in those decisions, they would have a conflict when a person later comes up for promotion or tenure. This is consistent with revisions #s 4 and 10.
4	5	III.C.2.b.	Current: “The SAPC shall make recommendations regarding tenure and promotion on academic grounds to senior rank to the Dean and the BOD. The SAPC has full authority to determine outcomes of the post-tenure review process. The SAPC shares authority to accept or deny applications to interrupt progression to tenure with department chairs.”	In regard to requests for extending the tenure probationary period, the SAPC noted that if they were involved in those decisions, they would have a conflict when a person later comes up for promotion or tenure. This is consistent with revisions #s 3 and 10.

			Proposed: “The SAPC shall make recommendations regarding tenure and promotion on academic grounds to senior rank to the Dean and the BOD. The SAPC has full authority to determine outcomes of the post-tenure review process.”	
5	9	VI.4.	Current: “Only those eligible to sit on a Council may vote for the members of the Council.” Proposed: “Only those eligible to sit on a Council may vote for the members of the Council, except that all voting faculty in each membership group may vote for the members of the Oversight Committee. ”	The Bylaws intent was for the relevant constituencies to vote for members of the appropriate Councils. For the Oversight Committee, only senior faculty may be members. The proposed change would allow all eligible faculty to <u>vote</u> for Oversight Committee candidates regardless of academic rank.
6	25	Appendix B, Section II.	Re-letter outline	Clerical.
7	29	Appendix B, Section I.C.4.a.	Current: “A high level of professional competence, as well as significant achievement in at least one of the following ...” Proposed: “A high level of professional competence, as well as significant achievement in one of the following ...”	Clarification of intent. The proposed change seeks to make it clear that there must be significant achievement in one category, as opposed to cumulative achievement in two or more categories.
8	31	Appendix B, Section I.E.3.	Add as first paragraph: “Consistent with the University Laws and Bylaws, only full-time faculty members may have tenure track positions or positions with tenure.”	Clarifies that academic tenure at the University and, therefore, UCHC only applies to full-time faculty.
9	32	Appendix B, Section I.E.3.	Current: “Assistant Professors shall be considered for tenure between five and seven years after initial appointment, except when the original appointment is January or later. Then the probationary period will begin the following September 1. Consideration for tenure must take place not later than the seventh probationary year. Tenure shall take effect at the beginning of the appointment year following a positive decision by the Board of Directors. If tenure is not awarded, the terminal year is defined by the University Laws and Bylaws.”	Clarification of language regarding the period in which a person can come up for tenure. Previous language was confusing for some.

			<p>Proposed: “Ordinarily, Assistant Professors may be nominated for tenure at the end of the fifth, sixth, or seventh year after initial appointment, except when the original appointment is January 1 to August 31. Then the probationary period will begin the following September 1. Nomination for tenure must take place not later than the end of the seventh probationary year. Tenure shall take effect at the beginning of the appointment year following a positive decision by the Board of Directors. “</p> <p>“If tenure is not approved by the end of the eighth year, the terminal year is defined by the University Laws and Bylaws. A faculty member denied tenure then may not transfer to the in-residence track.”</p>	
10	32	Appendix B, Section I.E.4.	<p>Current: “Such requests must be approved by the Department Chair and the SAPC.”</p> <p>Proposed: “Such requests must be approved by the Department Chair and the Dean’s Office.”</p>	In regard to requests for extending the tenure probationary period, the SAPC noted that if they were involved in those decisions, they would have a conflict when a person later comes up for promotion or tenure. This is consistent with revisions #s 3 and 4.
11	32	Appendix B, Section I.F.	<p>Current: “Change of professional category can and should occur with a change in job description. Change of professional category can occur at any time in the nine years after initial appointment as Assistant Professor, but must occur at least two years before consideration for promotion and must be signed by the faculty member and approved by the department chair and the Dean. No change in professional category is allowed after nine years as Assistant Professor.”</p> <p>“Full-time faculty members who leave the in-residence track for an appointment in the tenure track may then be eligible for tenure according to the <u>University of Connecticut Laws and By-Laws.</u>”</p>	Clarification of intent.

			<p>Proposed: “Change of professional category can and should occur with a change in job description. Change of professional category can occur at any time, but must occur at least two years before consideration for promotion. No change in professional category is allowed for Assistant Professors after nine years.”</p> <p>“Full-time faculty members who leave the in-residence track for an appointment in the tenure track may then be eligible for tenure according to the <u>University of Connecticut Laws and By-Laws</u>. Transfers from either the tenure to the non-tenure track or from the non-tenure to the tenure track can be made on one occasion only, and such a change is irreversible.”</p> <p>“All changes of professional categories and tracks must be approved by the faculty member, department chair, and the Dean.”</p>	<p>With flexibility of time for tenure and promotion decisions, OC voted for this clarification.</p>
12	33	Appendix B, Section I.G.	<p>Current: “If a faculty member of senior rank or who previously achieved tenure voluntarily discontinues employment with the University but is rehired after an interval of one year or more, the faculty member must be reviewed and approved again for both senior rank and tenure.”</p> <p>Proposed: “If a faculty member of senior rank or who previously achieved tenure voluntarily discontinues employment with the University but is rehired after an interval of one year or more, the faculty member must be reviewed and approved again for appointment at senior rank and, if in the tenure track, for tenure.”</p>	<p>Clarification of intent.</p>
13	34	Appendix B, Section II.B.2.	<p>Current: “Committee members who hold primary or secondary appointments from a nominee’s department will not receive the written materials and will not be present during discussion by the reviewers, nor be eligible to vote.”</p>	<p>Rationale: Previously, the SAPC was responsible for approving secondary appointments, but this policy was abandoned a number of years ago, and department chairs, in consultation with the School of Medicine Dean, now make such decisions. Given that secondary appointments are quite common,</p>

			<p>Proposed: “Committee members who hold primary appointments in the nominee’s primary department of appointment will not receive the written materials and will not be present during discussion by the reviewers, nor be eligible to vote.”</p>	<p>and that faculty members often are not well acquainted with secondary members of their departments, automatic recusal of SAPC members was not viewed as being appropriate. Moreover, from a practical point of view, secondary appointments in large departments (e.g., the Department of Medicine) might make it difficult for the SAPC to obtain a quorum. In line with current policy, it would still be expected that SAPC members would recuse themselves if they had close ties or collaborated with a nominee who had a secondary appointment in their department, but this would be determined on a case-by-case basis under the proposed policy.</p>
14	36	Appendix B, Section III.A.	<p>Current: “Obligations of the Department Chair to Department Members Working Toward Promotion to Senior Rank and/or Tenure”</p> <p>Proposed: “Obligations of the Department Chair to Department Members”</p>	<p>Clarification of intent; the section applies to all department members, not just faculty working towards promotion and/or tenure.</p>
15	36	Appendix B, Section III.A.2.a.	<p>Current: “Review progress with all department members, other than tenured Professors, and formulate a written summary to be filed in the Dean's Office, including revision of expectations if there are to be changes in responsibilities.”</p> <p>Proposed: “Review progress with all department members and formulate a written summary to be filed in the Dean’s Office, including revision of expectations if there are to be changes in responsibilities.”</p>	<p>Clarification of intent; reflects post-tenure review process.</p>
16	38	Appendix C, Section A.1.	<p>Current: “The faculty member receives at least two “marginally meets expectation” ratings in a five year review period that commences when tenure is awarded and is reset after each 5 years. This trigger only occurs at the end of each 5-year cycle.”</p> <p>Proposed: “The faculty member receives at least</p>	<p>Change in terminology makes Bylaws consistent with merit review rankings.</p>

			two “ marginal performance ” ratings in a five year review period that commences when tenure is awarded and is reset after each 5 years. This trigger only occurs at the end of each 5-year cycle.”	
17	38	Appendix C, Section A.2.	<p>Current: “The faculty member receives one “fails to meet expectation” rating. This trigger only occurs at the end of each 5-year cycle. EXCEPTION: during the period July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2010, two consecutive “fails to meet expectations” ratings will be cause for post-tenure review, and in this time interval such review will begin immediately (i.e. doesn’t wait for the end of the 5-year cycle).”</p> <p>Proposed: “The faculty member receives one “not acceptable performance” rating. This trigger only occurs at the end of each 5-year cycle. EXCEPTION: during the period July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2010, two consecutive “not acceptable performance” ratings will be cause for post-tenure review, and in this time interval such review will begin immediately (i.e. doesn’t wait for the end of the 5-year cycle).”</p>	Change in terminology makes Bylaws consistent with merit review rankings.
18	39	Appendix C, Section B.4.	<p>Current: “Within 3 months of the transmission by SAPC of an assessment of “unsatisfactory performance”, a “faculty development plan” must be prepared by the department chair and approved by the Dean. Each department will define a procedure for developing such a plan that will in the least involve the chair and the faculty member. If the faculty member fails to cooperate in the development of the plan, the plan may be developed and approved without the faculty member’s input.”</p> <p>Proposed: “Within 3 months of the transmission by SAPC of an assessment of “unsatisfactory performance”, a “faculty development plan” must be prepared by the department chair and approved by the Dean. Each department will define a</p>	Grammar change.

			<p>procedure for developing such a plan that will at least involve the chair and the faculty member. If the faculty member fails to cooperate in the development of the plan, the plan may be developed and approved without the faculty member’s input.”</p>	
19	41	Appendix D.V.	<p>Current: “<u>The Charge of the Review Committee:</u> The committee will provide both a comprehensive evaluation and recommendations in the relevant areas described below. The results of such reviews will be transmitted to the Dean and the Oversight Committee.”</p> <p>Proposed: “<u>The Charge of the Review Committee:</u> The committee will provide both a comprehensive evaluation and recommendations in the relevant areas described below. The results of such reviews will be transmitted to the Dean, the chair or director of the department or center under review, and the Oversight Committee.”</p>	<p>Clarification of intent; chair or director should receive the report of the department/center review committee.</p>