

**Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges
(SACSCOC) Review Requirements
School of Medicine Procedures**

Faculty Members

- SACS REQUIREMENT: All faculty members must be reviewed at least every three years unless the contract period is less than 3 years; if so, review must be conducted before the contract is renewed. These reviews must be documented in writing.

- SOM PROCEDURES:
 - Applicability: All Duke University-paid faculty (including interim extraordinary pay for a role with duration, not one-time activity – e.g., payment for lecture), regardless of faculty type
 - Review Procedure:
 - All applicable faculty excluding tenured faculty and those in first year of hire - Annual written performance review each fiscal year preferably conducted through review meeting
 - All tenured faculty - Review at least once every three years preferably conducted through review meeting
 - All faculty in first year hired prior to January 1 - Written review by April 1 (recommend 90-120 assessment as part of onboarding) preferably conducted through review meeting
 - Faculty with formal, paid administrative appointments must have written annual review of their administrative role
 - Faculty and administrative review may be discussed in one meeting documented in one evaluation report; or can be two meetings if necessary
 - Reviewer must have appropriate knowledge of work performed and must sign review. Faculty member must also sign (can be acknowledged via email which should be included with final review)
 - Departments responsible for review of faculty; collect information for review from centers/institutes as applicable
 - Format or template of review not specified but should focus on accomplishments of faculty member and identify any issues for resolution
 - Date of annual review for faculty members must be entered into a new field in dFac by business unit
 - Departments store reviews electronically/locally; no central repository

Staff Members

- SACS REQUIREMENT: All staff must be reviewed at least every three years
- SOM PROCEDURES:
 - Applicability: All non-faculty staff excluding temporary and seasonal non-faculty staff
 - Review Procedure:

- SOM follows Duke requirement of annual review, which should include review meeting and written review
- Reviewer must have appropriate knowledge of work performed and sign review as well as staff member must sign (can be acknowledged via SAP or email which should be included with final review)

Key Terms

- Review meeting – formal conversation between supervisor (or designee with first-hand knowledge) and employee/faculty member to discuss the review report and overall job performance, goals, expectations; date of review meetings to be recorded in dFac
- Annual Written review/assessment – summary of performance to date, with goals and development plan, to be signed by employee and supervisor/designee and to be electronically stored in departmental files
- 90-120 day onboarding assessment – meeting to determine new faculty member is making adequate progress toward expectations outlined in offer letter, ensure connection made with mentor(s), and identify any potential support needed

Frequently Asked Questions

1. **Q:** Who is required to do the faculty member review?
A: Department chair or his/her designee with knowledge of work performed (e.g., division chief, vice chair, mentor)
2. **Q:** Are employees of DUHS and the PDC with faculty appointments included in this requirement?
A: If they do not receive any compensation from Duke University, they are excluded.
3. **Q:** Is there a minimum amount of information required for faculty reviews?
A: Documented content of the review is not specified (see suggested forms – link below) BUT it is suggested faculty accomplishments and identification of issues affecting progress should be discussed. What IS required is signature of reviewer and faculty member, entry into dFac, and maintenance of electronic copy in department records.
4. **Q:** Will there be a central location to document completion of review?
A: Yes, dFac is being updated to include a location to document date of the review of faculty; staff evaluation reports are stored in SAP or secure, department shared files.
5. **Q:** What are the requirements for storing documentation of the completed review?
A: At this point, it is required that the business unit store documentation of the review in a manner that copies of the review can be provided if requested.
6. **Q:** Will the SOM monitor completion of reviews?
A: Yes, dFac will have reporting available for monitoring faculty, and staff will be monitored through SAP tool and verification with academic unit managers.
7. **Q:** Is it required that performance concerns be recorded in the annual review?

A: It is expected the annual review will capture all concerns about faculty performance. In the event there are problems, they should be detailed in this document so that the faculty member receives clear communication about the concerns, and, if relevant, that it may affect employment. If this is NOT articulated in the review for any reason, concerns should be communicated in writing with adequate time for course correction. In cases where non-renewal is contemplated, this letter should be provided well before the January 15 deadline for notification of non-renewal.

8. Q: What is the procedure if the faculty member disagrees with the review and refuses to sign?

A: The annual review requires the faculty member's signature. If the faculty member disagrees, he/she should sign indicating they disagree with the assessment. They may also write a separate letter to accompany the review to explain why they disagree, but a signature is required on the review document.

9. Q: Is there a template for annual reviews that can be used, or modified, by a department?

A: Yes. Annual review forms for Clinical and Basic Science faculty are available on the Office for Faculty website (link below). Some departments may choose to use Scholars@Duke or some other format it presently uses.

<https://medschool.duke.edu/about-us/faculty-resources/faculty-development/resources/faculty-annual-reviews>