

**THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA**  
**Performance Review of Tenured Faculty 2011-2012**

---



**The University of North Carolina General Administration**

*October 2012*

## Report to the Personnel and Tenure Committee UNC Board of Governors

---

### Performance Review of Tenured Faculty 2011-12

#### Introduction

Since 1998-99, the Division of Academic Affairs has collected campus data on the outcomes of post-tenure review. Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, or post-tenure review, was adopted by the Board in May 1997 and is intended “to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by (1) recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance; (2) providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found deficient; and (3) for those whose performance remains deficient, providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which may, in the most serious cases, include a recommendation for discharge” (*UNC Policy Manual*, 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1 {G}).

University of North Carolina (UNC) campuses developed their own policies and procedures within the Board’s requirements, which included the following: each campus must “ensure a cumulative review no less frequently than every five years for each tenured faculty member; involve peers as reviewers; include written feedback to faculty members as well as a mechanism for faculty response to the evaluation; and require individual development or career plans for each faculty member receiving less than satisfactory ratings in the cumulative review, including specific steps designed to lead to improvement, a specified time line for development, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time line.”

As a result of discussions held by the Personnel and Tenure Committee during 2006-2007, a review of post-tenure review policies

and practices was undertaken that involved discussions with Chief Academic Officers, the UNC Faculty Assembly, and a committee appointed by Senior Vice President Martin to review relevant Board policies. As a result of these deliberations, the Board of Governors authorized revised Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty (*Guidelines* 400.3.3.1[G]) in March 2008 and a revised policy on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty (*Policy* 400.3.3) in October 2008. The revised Policy and Guidelines clarified and strengthened the expected processes and outcomes involved in performance review of tenured faculty. UNC constituent institutions reviewed and revised their campus post-tenure review policies and processes to align with the Board’s revisions. See Appendix A for links to every UNC campus’ post-tenure review policies.

#### Outcomes of Performance Reviews

As part of the fourteenth year in which post-tenure reviews have been conducted, information was collected from campuses for 2011-12. Across all campuses in 2011-12, tenured faculty represented 46.3% of the full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty. As summarized in Table 1 on the next page, 779 tenured faculty members were reviewed, of which 35 (4.5%) were found “deficient” based on institutional criteria. Table 1 includes information on the outcomes of post-tenure performance review reported by UNC campuses for the last ten years (2002-03 through 2011-12).

**Table 1. Ten-Year Post-Tenure Review Trends:  
2002-03 to 2011-12**

Year	Faculty Reviewed	Faculty Deficient	% Found Deficient
2002-03	572	15	2.6%
2003-04	1,106	19	1.7%
2004-05	676	25	3.7%
2005-06	690	14	2.0%
2006-07	659	22	3.3%
2007-08	648	21	3.2%
2008-09	1,178	22	1.9%
2009-10	666	22	3.3%
2010-11	690	18	2.6%
2011-12	779	35	4.5%
<b>10-Year Total</b>	<b>7,664</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>2.8%</b>

Source: UNC-GA IRA/WG002/03OCT12

Table 2 shows the number of faculty found deficient in post-tenure performance reviews at each campus over the past ten years.

**Table 2. Number of Faculty Deficient in Post-Tenure Reviews:  
2002-03 to 2011-12**

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	Total Deficient
ASU	0	0	1	0	4	1	2	2	3	2	15
ECU	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
ECSU	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	1	1	1	9
FSU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
NC A&T	0	1	1	2	5	2	3	0	2	2	18
NCCU	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	1	1	13
NCSU	14	9	13	4	1	6	6	2	5	7	67
UNCA	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	3	1	0	9
UNC-CH	0	3	5	2	4	3	3	5	4	13	42
UNCC	1	3	4	2	3	1	0	1	0	1	16
UNCG	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	4
UNCP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
UNCW	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
WCU	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	7
WSSU	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>213</b>

Source: UNC-GA IRA/WG003/03OCT12

For the post-tenure review process in 2011-12, the majority of tenured faculty reviewed were full tenured professors (59.3%) with associate tenured professors (40.0%), assistant tenured professors (0.4%), and tenured librarians (0.3%) also being reviewed. Thirty-five faculty were deemed “deficient” or “unsatisfactory” by teams of peer reviewers. The percent of “deficient” or “unsatisfactory” for this academic year was higher than previous years (4.5% compared to 2.6% in 2010-11). Although deficiency was higher this year, overall the reviews were positive with 63.2% of the faculty receiving satisfactory performance reviews, 7.3% were deemed above average, and 25% were given superior performance reviews. See Appendix B for more details.

As part of the post-tenure review process conducted at each campus, those tenured faculty deemed “deficient” or “unsatisfactory” will begin working with their departments on mandatory development plans as detailed in each campus’ policies and procedures related to UNC Policy Manual, 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1G.

The majority of faculty found to be “deficient” or “unsatisfactory” over the last three academic years participated in and completed (or continue to participate in) mandatory development plans. Some faculty have retired in conjunction with the post-tenure review findings (4 from both 2008-09 and 2009-10 reviews have retired) and others have begun phased retirements.

For the 18 faculty found deficient in the 2010-11 post-tenure review, 12 initially participated in a mandatory development plan (10 continue to work under this plan and 2 satisfactorily completed the development process), 1 retired, and 3 were reviewed a second time and found to be satisfactory. The final 2 found deficient chose to resign their positions. See Appendix C for more details.

## Appendix A

### Campus Post-Tenure Review Policies

Campus	Link
Appalachian State University	<a href="http://facultyhandbook.appstate.edu/sites/facultyhandbook.appstate.edu/files/Faculty%20Handbook%20092612.pdf">http://facultyhandbook.appstate.edu/sites/facultyhandbook.appstate.edu/files/Faculty%20Handbook%20092612.pdf</a>
East Carolina University	<a href="http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/currentfacultymanual/part9.pdf">http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/currentfacultymanual/part9.pdf</a>
Elizabeth City State University	<a href="http://www.ecsu.edu/administration/legal/docs/policymanual.pdf">http://www.ecsu.edu/administration/legal/docs/policymanual.pdf</a>
Fayetteville State University	<a href="http://www.uncfsu.edu/documents/policy/employment/Post-Tenure_Review_Rev1.pdf">http://www.uncfsu.edu/documents/policy/employment/Post-Tenure_Review_Rev1.pdf</a>
NC A&T	<a href="http://www.ncat.edu/provost/docs/Post-Tenure%20Review%20-%20Amended-Fall%202009.pdf">http://www.ncat.edu/provost/docs/Post-Tenure%20Review%20-%20Amended-Fall%202009.pdf</a>
North Carolina Central University	<a href="http://www.ncc.edu/formsdocs/proxy.cfm?file_id=1921">http://www.ncc.edu/formsdocs/proxy.cfm?file_id=1921</a>
NC State University	<a href="http://policies.ncsu.edu/category/personnel/faculty/post-tenure-review-ptr-rules">http://policies.ncsu.edu/category/personnel/faculty/post-tenure-review-ptr-rules</a>
UNC Asheville	<a href="http://www2.unca.edu/aa/handbook/3.htm#3.7">http://www2.unca.edu/aa/handbook/3.htm#3.7</a>
UNC-Chapel Hill	<a href="http://www.unc.edu/campus/policies/UNC-Chapel%20Hill%20Tenure%20Policies%20and%20Procedures.pdf">http://www.unc.edu/campus/policies/UNC-Chapel%20Hill%20Tenure%20Policies%20and%20Procedures.pdf</a>
UNC Charlotte	<a href="http://legal.uncc.edu/policies/up-102.14">http://legal.uncc.edu/policies/up-102.14</a>
UNC Greensboro	<a href="http://provost.uncg.edu/documents/personnel/posttenurereview.pdf">http://provost.uncg.edu/documents/personnel/posttenurereview.pdf</a>
UNC Pembroke	<a href="http://www.uncp.edu/aa/handbook/12-13/12-13.pdf">http://www.uncp.edu/aa/handbook/12-13/12-13.pdf</a>
UNC Wilmington	<a href="http://www.uncw.edu/fac_handbook/employment/evaluation/post_ten_review.htm">http://www.uncw.edu/fac_handbook/employment/evaluation/post_ten_review.htm</a>
Western Carolina University	<a href="http://www.wcu.edu/WebFiles/PDFs/S012_13FacultyHandbook_FINAL_Online_8_7_12.pdf">http://www.wcu.edu/WebFiles/PDFs/S012_13FacultyHandbook_FINAL_Online_8_7_12.pdf</a>
Winston-Salem State University	<a href="http://www.wssu.edu/administration/officeof-the-provost">http://www.wssu.edu/administration/officeof-the-provost</a>

# APPENDIX Q

## Appendix B

### 2011-2012 Post-Tenure Review Survey Information by Institution

	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNC-CH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	TOTAL
1. # of PTR conducted																
Tenured Professor	45	3	8	0	16	5	105	16	160	30	30	9	18	13	4	<b>462</b>
Tenured Associate Professor	19	2	0	10	14	3	46	14	97	31	34	8	17	15	2	<b>312</b>
Tenured Assistant Professor	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	<b>3</b>
Tenured Professional Librarians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
<b>Total reviewed</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>779</b>
2. # of Faculty as Reviewers	102	15	17	125	90	25	230	4	456	82	148	54	84	64	16	<b>1,512</b>
3. Outcome																
a. deficient or unsatisfactory	2	0	1	1	2	1	7	0	13	1	1	0	1	2	3	<b>35</b>
b. satisfactory	23	0	0	9	13	3	144	31	77	60	65	18	21	26	2	<b>492</b>
c. above average	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	54	0	0	0	0	0	1	<b>57</b>
d. superior	39	5	5	1	15	4	0	0	113	0	0	0	13	0	0	<b>195</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>779</b>

Source: UNC-GA IRA/WG004/03OCT12

# APPENDIX Q

## Appendix C

### Status of Faculty Found "Deficient\*" 2008-09 through 2010-11

2008-09	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNC-CH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	TOTAL
(a) # found deficient or unsatisfactory	2	4	0	0	3	3	6	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	22
(b) # of these faculty members who participated in mandatory development plan	0	2	0	0	2	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	12
(c) # of these faculty members received their first "deficient" or "unsatisfactory"	0	2	0	0	3	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	13
(d) # of these faculty members who:																
i. Reviewed a second time & "satisfactory"	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
ii. Continue to work under mandatory development plan	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	8
iii. Retired	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
iv. other (please explain)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
<b>2009-10</b>																
(a) # found deficient or unsatisfactory	2	0	1	0	0	6	2	3	5	1	0	2	0	0	0	22
(b) # of these faculty members who participated in mandatory development plan	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	13
(c) # of these faculty members received their first "deficient" or "unsatisfactory"	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	5	1	0	2	0	0	0	15
(d) # of these faculty members who:																
i. Reviewed a second time & "satisfactory"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
ii. Continue to work under mandatory development plan	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	7
iii. Retired	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
iv. other (please explain)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>2010-11</b>																
(a) # found deficient or unsatisfactory	3	0	1	0	2	1	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	18
(b) # of these faculty members who participated in mandatory development plan	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	12
(c) # of these faculty members received their first "deficient" or "unsatisfactory"	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	13
(d) # of these faculty members who:																
i. Reviewed a subsequent time & "satisfactory"	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
ii. Continue to work under mandatory development plan	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	10
iii. Retired	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
iv. other (please explain)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Source: UNC-GA IRA/WG005/03OCT12

Explanation for Other Category:

ASU: Dating back to 2002, Appalachian's Post Tenure Review (PTR) process required a mandatory development plan only in cases in which the committee findings were "decidedly negative." The new process, adopted in 2009-10, requires a remediation plan in all PTR cases in which performance is unsatisfactory. In 2010-2011, the two faculty members indicated in the "other" column resigned.

NCSU: One was reviewed a third time and found "satisfactory".

UNC-CH: In 2011-12, the faculty member begins year 2 of 3 of phased retirement.

\* More than one category of data may apply. Therefore, the sum of rows (b) and (c) may be greater than the total number of faculty members given in row (a).