



# GUIDELINES

The University of North Carolina  
*General Administration*

---

**Date:** May 29, 2007

**Subject:** Proposed revisions, June 2007

**The UNC Policy Manual: 400.3.3.1[G]**

Adopted: 06/24/97

Amended: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty**

### **Background**

At its meeting on May 16, 1997, the Board of Governors adopted the recommendations in the report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review. A copy of that report is available at General Administration. Post-tenure review is defined in the report as "a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality" (p. 8).

The report asserts that review of the performance of tenured faculty in the University shall be "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" ( p. 12).

The report also provides broad principles for carrying out such reviews but leaves room for each institution to develop the details of its own process within one year following the release of guidelines by General Administration. In keeping with Section 602 of *The Code*, the Board of Trustees of each constituent institution shall adopt the policies and regulations governing performance reviews of tenured faculty. Institutional policies and procedures will also be approved by the Board of Governors and should be included in all appropriate documents of the constituent institutions.

The report further specifies that "developing a system of post-tenure review will require reexamination of the effectiveness of current faculty personnel policies as well as planning and program review policies" (p. 13). Initiation of these performance reviews in the University of North Carolina provides constituent institutions with an opportunity to create a policy that examines individual faculty contributions to departmental, school/college, and university goals as well as to the academic programs in which faculty teach. Thoughtful attention to the ways in which post-tenure review can promote faculty vitality across their careers will assure that such reviews lead to increased effectiveness within the university.

Guidelines to assist in formulating institutional policy concerning performance reviews of tenured faculty are set out below. Guidelines adopted in June 1997 were used by constituent institutions to develop their post-tenure review policies. Revision of the guidelines was deemed necessary because of the substantial discrepancies in post-tenure review outcomes noted among constituent institutions over a period of years. A review of constituent institution policies identified practices at some institutions that constrained the rigorous application of post-tenure review as intended by the Board of Governors.

### **Guidelines**

The following guidelines shall be observed in developing institutional policies and procedures for post-tenure review:

1. Institutions shall review their policies and procedures for implementing post-tenure review and revise them as necessary to conform with the following amended guidelines. Proposed revised policies must be submitted to General Administration for approval no later than December 12007. Implementation of revised policies will be effective upon approval by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.
2. Institutional policy statements shall show the relationship between the annual performance review of tenured faculty and the post-tenure review. Annual performance reviews, however, are not a substitute for the "comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review" required by the Board of Governors. The post-

tenure review process can be informed by annual reviews but must involve an additional assessment as described in these guidelines.

**Deleted:** Positive annual reviews alone cannot be used to justify a positive cumulative review or avoid a negative cumulative review.

3. Institutional reviews shall provide for the evaluation of all aspects of the professional performance of faculty whose primary responsibilities are teaching, and/or research, and/or service. If faculty responsibilities are primarily only in one or two of these areas, post-tenure review and resulting recommendations should take this allocation of responsibilities into account.
4. Institutional policies shall assure that faculty performance will be examined relative to the mission of the institution, college, and program.
5. Institutional policies shall assure that each tenured faculty member undergoes a cumulative review no less frequently than every five years. (Note: a review undertaken to grant tenure or to decide on promotion qualifies as such a cumulative review.)
6. Institutional policies shall explicitly involve peers in the review process. A peer review committee for a department or academic unit will be selected by a process agreed upon by the tenured faculty in that unit. The faculty member being reviewed will not have the option of selecting members of the peer review committee. The department chair or academic unit head must consult with the peer review committee. Post-tenure review outcomes in an academic unit must be reviewed at one or more higher administrative levels.
7. Institutional policies shall assure that there is written feedback to the faculty member being reviewed as well as a mechanism for faculty response to the evaluation. As intended by the Board of Governors, this feedback should include recognition for exemplary performance. Because performance rewards are often part of the annual review process, the post-tenure review may provide additional support for this form of recognition. A negative review must include a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member's assigned duties. Faculty response to a negative review will also be shared at the next highest administrative level.
8. Institutional policies shall be in compliance with the criteria and procedures for due process and for discharge or other disciplinary action established in Chapter VI of *The Code* of the University.
9. Institutional policies shall require individual development or career plans for all faculty receiving less than satisfactory ratings in the cumulative review. These plans must include specific steps designed to lead to improvement, a specified timeline in which improvement is expected to occur, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time line. The use of mentoring peers is encouraged, and progress meetings with the department chair or academic unit head must occur on at least a semi-annual basis during the

**Deleted:** elected

**Deleted:** shared

**Deleted:** the next

**Deleted:** (such as dean)

**Deleted:** for information and consultation.

**Deleted:** and rewards as feasible

**Deleted:**

**Deleted:**

| specified timeline. If duties are modified as a result of a less than satisfactory rating, then the development plan should so indicate and take into account the new allocation of responsibilities.

10. As policies are developed, institutions shall consider resource implications of a meaningful performance review system, identifying in advance the sources of support for the process and its outcomes.

---

Erskine Bowles, *President*



# The University of North Carolina

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

POST OFFICE BOX 2688, CHAPEL HILL, NC 27515-2688

HAROLD L. MARTIN, *Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs*

Telephone: (919) 843-8347 • Fax: (919) 962-0120 • E-mail: [hmartin@northcarolina.edu](mailto:hmartin@northcarolina.edu)

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** December 14, 2006  
**TO:** Personnel and Tenure Committee  
**FROM:** Harold L. Martin, Sr.  
**SUBJECT:** Post-Tenure Review Process

The Personnel and Tenure Committee's November discussion of post-tenure review was useful, and I offer comments based on that conversation and on additional analyses.

Attachment 1 shows the number of tenured faculty found deficient at each UNC campus annually from 2000-01 to 2005-06, the total at each campus found deficient during those years, the average number of tenured faculty at each campus during that period, and the percentage of that number found deficient. The percentage of tenured faculty found deficient during this six-year period ranges from zero at four institutions to 6.58 percent at NC State, with a system-wide average of 2.44 percent. There is sufficient variation in the percent of tenured faculty found deficient to suggest that campus reviews of their post-tenure evaluation processes are warranted.

Attachment 2 provides a bulleted summary of current campus post-tenure review policies. The summary only provides highlights of each process for comparative purposes. Some variations among the policies can be attributed to campus size and complexity, and there are also similarities due to conformance with §400.3.3 of the *UNC Policy Manual*, "Performance Review of Tenured Faculty." Nevertheless, when campus policies are compared to performance review outcomes summarized in Attachment 1, some tentative observations can be made:

- When a review process relies extensively on outcomes of annual performance reviews, this may inhibit a finding of deficiency if the annual reviews generally have been positive. While it seems logical that annual reviews should contribute to the post-tenure review process, annual reviews may not be conducted with the same rigor and thoroughness required of the post-tenure review. Campuses may need to balance annual review summaries with additional in-depth analysis from peer review teams and other sources.
- Some campuses allow the faculty member being reviewed to select two of the three peer committee members, reducing the possibility of a negative outcome. Some campuses place much of the review burden on the unit Chair rather than on the peer review group, and this also appears to lessen the

Appalachian State  
University

East Carolina  
University

Elizabeth City  
State University

Fayetteville State  
University

North Carolina  
Agricultural and  
Technical State  
University

North Carolina  
Central University

North Carolina  
School of  
the Arts

North Carolina  
State University  
at Raleigh

University of  
North Carolina  
at Asheville

University of  
North Carolina  
at Chapel Hill

University of  
North Carolina  
at Charlotte

University of  
North Carolina  
at Greensboro

University of  
North Carolina  
at Pembroke

University of  
North Carolina  
at Wilmington

Western Carolina  
University

Winston-Salem  
State University

- possibility of negative reviews. Although these reviews inevitably reflect campus and departmental culture and norms, a highly involved peer review committee that is elected by the unit's tenured faculty appears to be an effective approach. Additionally, the involvement of a higher level administrator for review and consultation, such as a dean, appears to strengthen the review process.
- Campus post-tenure review policies generally do not provide much description of the expectations or components of a development plan produced as a result of a negative evaluation. Although a few policies specify teaching, scholarly activity, and service as the parameters of the review process, none provide any detail on suggested activities to address deficiencies in each of these areas. Some do prescribe ongoing interaction with a peer committee or mentor, which would seem to be a useful practice.

With these observations in mind, I suggest that UNC institutions be asked to review their post-tenure review policies and processes to ensure that consistent and effective outcomes are produced. While adjustments in some policies may be needed, it is also possible that changes are needed not only in the wording but in the rigor and expectations with which they are applied. It is difficult to assess such intangibles, but the following can be suggested:

- If a campus relies extensively on summaries of annual reviews for the post-tenure review and if the campus rarely or never finds deficiencies in the post-tenure review, then it might be assumed that the annual review process is effective in addressing any identified problems. In such a case, as part of the post-tenure review policy, the campus should describe expectations, outcomes, and follow-up provided in the annual review process.
- Perhaps because there is no *UNC Policy Manual* mandate, few campus policies offer much information on the follow-up process for an identified deficiency other than mandated periodic meetings and reviews. Policies can provide better guidance on specific activities and expectations that can be established for improvement in teaching, scholarly activity, and service. While the process for identifying a deficiency is important, the process for remedying that deficiency should be equally important. I recommend that UNC institutions provide additional guidance to their academic units regarding these follow-up steps.

Attachment 1

**Tenured Faculty Deficient 2000-01 to 2005-06 and Total Deficient; Average Number of  
Tenured Faculty 00-01 to 05-06; Percent Deficient**

	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	Total	Faculty Number	Percent Deficient
ASU	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	379	0.53
ECU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	539	0
ECSU	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	54	5.56
FSU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	0
NCA&T	0	2	0	1	1	2	6	206	2.91
NCCU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	0
NCSU	14	14	14	9	13	4	68	1034	6.58
UNCA	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	99	2.02
UNC- CH	6	7	0	3	5	2	23	1240	1.85
UNCC	3	0	1	3	4	2	13	362	3.59
UNCG	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	320	0.63
UNCP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	0
UNCW	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	268	0.37
WCU	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	175	0.57
WSSU	0	NA	0	0	0	1	1	81	3.70
<b>TOTAL</b>	25	24	15	22	25	13	124	5073	2.44

## Summary of Campus Post-Tenure Review Policies

### ASU

- Post-tenure review committee (chair, two peers chosen by faculty member and one chosen by chair).
- Portfolio submitted including all student evaluations from minimum of three years, results of classroom observations, course syllabi, overview of scholarly activity, goals.
- Committee members provide written evaluation on teaching, scholarly activity, and public service.
- Chair provides summary with recommended remediation from committee, timeline not to exceed four years, and consequences.
- Appeals committee elected for each unit, then grievance process if requested.
- Consequences must be in compliance with Chapter IV of Faculty Handbook and Chapter VI of The Code.

### ECU

- Summary of annual evaluations is used as the basis for review.
- Initial review conducted by the unit administrator using a standardized form.
- This report and annual reviews are reviewed by a Cumulative Review Committee (CRC) that is elected by the unit's Tenure Committee.
- Faculty member can respond and request reconsideration. Appeal can be made to next higher administrator.
- Development plan to be developed with the CRC and unit administrator. Development plan should not exceed three years and will be reviewed annually by CRC and administrator with written response.
- If performance remains deficient, unit administrator may recommend sanctions as governed by Appendix D, Section VI, "Due Process Before Discharge or Imposition of Serious Sanction," of the ECU Faculty Manual and Chapter VI of The Code.

### ECSU

- Substandard performance will be documented from annual reviews as summarized by peer reviewers and the department head. Student evaluations are included.
- Course of action is planned by faculty member, administrator, and peer review committee for the next year.
- A Faculty Peer Committee is appointed to work with the faculty member: one selected by chair, one selected by faculty member, and one from outside the unit agreed upon by chair and faculty member.
- If next annual evaluation does not meet expectations, Faculty Peer Committee makes recommendations on further corrective measures or initiating discharge procedures.
- Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs resolves appealed issues.

### FSU

- Assistant and associate professors reviewed every third year, full professors every five years.



- Faculty member provides summary of teaching, scholarly, and service activities over the period being covered along with copies of annual Faculty Comprehensive Evaluation forms.
- A Peer Review Committee (one selected by chair, one selected by faculty member, and one from outside the unit agreed upon by dean and faculty member) will produce a report.
- Report and faculty member's response, if any, will be provided to chair.
- If there is a "needs improvement" rating, chair will create a two-year (assistant and associate professor) or three-year (full professor) development plan with statement of sanctions. Dean must approve.
- Sanctions may include discharge or suspension from employment or reduction in rank as stated by The Code.

#### NCA&T

- PTR evaluations are based on performance standards developed by department faculty for teaching, scholarly activities, and service. Standards may be developed for an overall rating or for each of the three areas.
- A low rating in one area might be offset by a high rating in another area. A "distinctly deficient" rating in one area cannot be offset by other strengths.
- A Post-tenure Review Committee (PRC) will consist of two faculty selected by the faculty member and one selected by tenured faculty of the department.
- Faculty member will submit a portfolio following standardized submission form, which may include internal and external letters of support.
- PRC rates each of the three areas. Chair reviews and responds to PRC findings, and chair letter and review are forwarded to the dean. Dean also writes letter and all letters and reports are given to the Provost/VC for Academic Affairs.
- If rating is "deficient in one or more areas," the response may be a Performance Development Plan (PDP) or assignment of additional duties in another area (e.g., more teaching instead of research). PDP is required if deficient in teaching.
- For first two years faculty member and chair meet semi-annually, and chair sends a report to the dean. Final report to dean is done at end of third year.
- If still deficient, faculty teams review classroom teaching. Dean's letter to Provost results in sanction, if any. Multiple review and appeals procedures throughout the overall process.

#### NCCU

- A unit-specific PTR committee will review summaries of standard evaluations as assembled by the chair.
- PTR committee is advisory to the VCAA, advises either "passes" or "performance deficits."
- Professional development plan will cover two to three years, with reviews at least annually.
- If deficiencies have not been corrected after a third review, faculty member may be seriously sanctioned or terminated in conformity with The Code. VCAA will consult with the PRR committee.

## NCSU

- Associate professors reviewed every three years, full professors every five years, or at any time required by dean based on annual reviews.
- Comprehensive Review Committee (CRC) is developed by department tenured faculty.
- Faculty member provides portfolio of summary statements, annually activity reports, course evaluations, and peer reviews.
- CRC provides written description of deficiencies, advice, consultation, and annual review until the CRC assessment changes.
- Department head provides dean with CRC assessment, plan for professional development, and any recommendation for administrative action.
- Recurrence of similar negative assessments for two years in sequence or three years in five may justify serious sanctions including discharge for cause.

## UNCA

- University-wide Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) reviews dossier of documents including statement, chair's evaluation, peer observations, annual faculty records, merit reviews, and course evaluations.
- PTRC makes recommendations to VCAA. Faculty member will construct a development plan in consultation with Associate VCAA and chair. Plan may include a peer mentor.
- Faculty member is reviewed again between one and three years later by PTRC.
- PTRC may conclude additional development work is needed over one to two years.
- At final review sanctions may include discharge or other disciplinary action in compliance with The Code.

## UNC-CH

- Each appointing unit develops processes and Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC).
- Review involves qualitative and quantitative evidence of all aspects of performance including annual reviews, publications, and teaching evaluations.
- Development plans are developed by faculty member and unit head with annual reviews over a three-year period.
- Failure to complete development plan results in unit head notifying dean, who will consider dismissal or other disciplinary action under Trustee Policies.

## UNCC

- Department Review Committee reviews file containing annual review letters from chair, CV, and optional statement describing accomplishments. Committee may meet with faculty member, chair, or others.
- Committee is advisory to the chair. Standards for "seriously deficient" are determined by unit faculty and approved by chair, dean, and provost.
- Chair submits written appraisal to dean. When chair and dean agree on deficiency, faculty member and chair will prepare development plan with goals for a two-three year period and statement of consequences.
- Progress will be monitored in annual reviews. At end of period, chair reviews performance in consultation with Department Review Committee. Adjustment in the development plan may be required or appropriate sanctions after consultation with tenured faculty.
- Recommendation for sanctions is forwarded to the dean, who forwards to provost. Faculty member can request hearing.

## **UNCG**

- The annual review process includes a standard report form, peer review if requested by the faculty member, and the end of year report on performance from the unit head.
- The cumulative review prepared by the unit head summarizes the annual reports and requires significant peer review (committee of three). An unsatisfactory cumulative review can occur only if there have been at least two unsatisfactory annual reviews in the cycle.
- If an unsatisfactory cumulative review, the unit head in consultation with faculty member, dean, and peer evaluators must draft a plan for improvement to be completed within three years.
- If faculty member fails to meet expected levels of improvement, unit head may sign a formal document declaring faculty member professionally deficient and recommend discharge or other disciplinary action to Chancellor. The only admissible grounds are incompetence or neglect of duty as consistent with The Code.

## **UNCP**

- For cumulative evaluation, faculty member submits to chair self-evaluations for five years, student evaluation summaries for five years, annual chair evaluations, any needed additional information, and a peer evaluation nomination form.
- The chair appoints three faculty members to the Peer Evaluation Committee. The committee and chair, working independently of each other, prepare a Post-Tenure Evaluation Report Form for the VCAA. Faculty member may rebut reports.
- If deficiency found, chair and faculty member prepare plan not to exceed three years with steps and consequences.
- At end of period, VCAA in consultation with chair will determine if needed progress has been made. VCAA can recommend sanctions including discharge to the Chancellor.

## **UNCW**

- Each department establishes format for a faculty member's report on activities that will include all relevant activities and evaluations.
- Each department establishes a procedure for peer review by at least three faculty who present their evaluations to the chair. The chair will write an evaluation for the faculty member, who can respond.
- If deficiency is found, the chair and faculty member will create a development plan and timeline not to exceed three years.
- (Appeal processes for sanctions and discharge are described but the procedure by which these disciplinary actions would be taken is not described.)

## **WCU**

- Faculty member will provide four most recent annual evaluations and CV to a peer review committee.
- Tenured faculty of each department establish a procedure for review of these documents, with at least three faculty serving on a review committee.
- Evaluations given to the department head, who meets with faculty member and adds own evaluation to which faculty member may respond.
- If unsatisfactory review, department head, in consultation with committee, faculty member, and dean, creates a three-year development plan with semi-annual review and comments from department head and committee.

- (Consequences and appeals process are described, but decision process for imposing negative consequences is not described.)

#### **WSSU**

- The Annual Faculty Evaluation is the framework for post-tenure review. Annual evaluation defines measurable outcomes based on interest, expertise, and a professional plan for development.
- Each unit elects a three-member Post-Tenure Review Committee. The faculty member provides the committee with previous five years of annual evaluations; a summary of outcomes in teaching, scholarship, and service; CV; and any additional relevant material.
- If unsatisfactory performance is found, a development plan is developed by the faculty member and the unit head that contains outcomes and timeline not to exceed three years. Progress will be monitored as part of the annual evaluation process.
- The Post-Tenure Review Committee will review progress at the specified time. If performance remains unsatisfactory, the chair will recommend appropriate sanction to the division director.

**DRAFT**  
**Report to the Personnel and Tenure Committee**  
**UNC Board of Governors**

**Performance Review of Tenured Faculty**  
**2005-2006**

**January 3, 2007**

**Executive Summary**

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}). The guidelines state that 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.”

Since 1998-99, the Division of Academic Affairs has collected data on the outcomes of post-tenure review from chief academic officers and, in some years, from deans and department chairs. Information received from the UNC chief academic officers (CAOs) for 2005-2006 indicates that 690 tenured faculty were reviewed, of which 13, or 2%, were found “deficient” based on institutional criteria. Reports on the outcomes of post-tenure review available for eight years (1998-99 through 2005-2006) indicate that 188 or approximately 3% of faculty reviewed have been found deficient. This percentage has varied from 1% to 5% since the program was implemented; UNC’s eight-year percentage is well within the range of such percentages reported by other state systems (which have ranged from 2% to 9%).

Follow-up reports on the status of 108 faculty members who were evaluated as “deficient” during the five-year period 2000-01 through 2004-05 indicate that UNC institutions are acting on the results of the reviews to ensure that underperformers are being assisted through development plans or are leaving the institutions through retirement, resignation, or dismissal. Nearly half (47.2%) of the faculty members evaluated as “deficient” during these five years had retired, resigned, been dismissed, or dismissal procedures are in progress.

**DRAFT**

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

**Performance Review of Tenured Faculty  
2005-2006**

**January 3, 2007**

Since 1998-99, the Division of Academic Affairs has collected data on the outcomes of post-tenure review from chief academic officers and, in some years, from deans and department chairs. 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}). The guidelines state that

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.”

**Outcomes of Performance Reviews**

Information on the number and outcomes of the reviews was requested from chief academic officers (CAOs) for 2005-2006, the eighth year in which reviews have been conducted. Based on their reports, 690 tenured faculty were reviewed, of which 13, or 2%, were found “deficient” based on institutional criteria. The table below includes information on the outcomes of post-tenure review reported by UNC campuses for eight years (1998-99 through 2005-2006):

**DRAFT**  
**Outcomes of Post-Tenure Review, 1998-99 to 2005-06\***

<b>Year</b>	<b>Faculty Reviewed</b>	<b>Faculty Deficient</b>	<b>% Found Deficient</b>
1998-1999	1,162	16	1%
1999-2000	914	42	5%
2000-2001	781	28	4%
2001-2002	690	29	4%
2002-2003	572	13	2%
2003-2004	1,106	23	2%
2004-2005	676	24	4%
2005-2006	690	13	2%
<b>8-Year Totals</b>	<b>6,591</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>3%</b>

\*Some totals for previous years have been recalculated based on corrected numbers received from campuses.

The eight-year percentage of faculty found deficient as a result of post-tenure review, approximately 3%, is well within the range of such percentages reported by other state systems (which have ranged from 2% to 9%).\*\*

These results should be viewed in light of the fact that tenured faculty at UNC institutions are reviewed rigorously during their probationary years and when they are granted tenure, during an annual evaluation process including the chair and, in many cases, departmental peers, and when they are promoted to the rank of professor. Thus, it is not surprising that the great majority of tenured faculty University-wide would be found to be performing at a satisfactory level of performance. In addition, each year approximately 1,000-1,500 UNC faculty members serve as peer reviewers for the post-tenure review process, a significant commitment of faculty time and effort to the review process, especially when added to the time and effort of the faculty being reviewed, department chairs, deans, and chief academic officers.

### **Follow-Up on Previous Reviews**

In their 2006 reports, UNC chief academic officers reported on the status of 108 faculty members who were evaluated as “deficient” during the five-year period 2000-01 through 2004-05. These reports provide the following information about the status of these faculty members:

- 35 (32.4%) participated in a mandatory development plan and, when reviewed a second time, were evaluated as performing satisfactorily
- 21 (19.4%) continue to work under a mandatory development plan.
- 21 (19.4%) have retired.
- 16 (14.8%) had resigned.
- 14 (12.9%) had been dismissed or dismissal procedures are on-going.
- 1 (1%) was given an adjusted workload.

According to these reports, nearly half (47.2%) of the faculty members evaluated as “deficient” during these five years had retired, resigned, been dismissed, or dismissal procedures are in progress. These follow-up reports suggest that although a small percentage of faculty members are evaluated by their peers as performing below expectations, UNC institutions are acting on the results of the reviews to ensure that underperformers are being assisted through development plans or are leaving the institutions through retirement, resignation, or dismissal.

**DRAFT**  
**Evaluation of Post-Tenure Review**

In 2003, after five years of post-tenure review and data collection representing a full five year “cycle” of reviews as required by the Board’s policy, preliminary conclusions were drawn that, on the whole, the process had been successfully implemented and that most campuses had developed workable post-tenure review processes as part of a comprehensive faculty evaluation system. (See Report to the Personnel and Tenure Committee, “Performance Review of Tenured Faculty 1998-2003,” November 13, 2003.)

However, the Division of Academic Affairs, working with the Innovations in Faculty Work Life, developed a plan for a more comprehensive campus and system-wide review of policies, procedures, outcomes, benefits, and problems related to post-tenure review. The evaluation is intended to help campuses and the Office of the President develop recommendations for strengthening the value and effectiveness of post-tenure review for individual faculty members, their institutions, and the University as a whole.

Appalachian State University has administered a survey, adapted from a survey used widely across the country which was developed by Dr. Christine Licata for the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), on a number of aspects related to the review process. Campus administrators and faculty have reviewed the results and are using them as the basis for a revision of the post-tenure review process. North Carolina State University has included several questions adapted from the AAHE survey in its Faculty Well-Being Survey, to be administered Fall 2006. Other institutions have undertaken reviews of their policies and procedures; at North Carolina A&T State University, a faculty task force reviewed and proposed revisions which have in use since 2004-2005. At two institutions, Fayetteville State University and the University of North Carolina at Pembroke, no faculty have been evaluated as “deficient” since Performance Review of Tenured Faculty was implemented in 1998-99. In 2006-07, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Harold Martin will discuss the usefulness of an evaluation of the policy and procedures for Performance Review of Tenured Faculty at all UNC campuses that award tenure.

**\*\* See Christine M. Licata and Betsy E. Brown. *Post-Tenure Faculty Review and Renewal: Reporting Results and Shaping Policy*. Boston, MA:Anker Publishing, 2004.**