

DRAFT

Report to the Personnel and Tenure Committee UNC Board of Governors

Performance Review of Tenured Faculty 2006-2007

Note: As a result of discussions held by the Board of Governors Personnel and Tenure Committee during 2006-2007, a review of post-tenure review policies and practices has been undertaken that has involved discussions with Chief Academic Officers, the UNC Faculty Assembly, and a committee appointed by Senior Vice President Martin to review relevant Board policies. Recommendations from this process will be forthcoming to the Board in early 2008. The following report addresses post-tenure review as it has been conducted under the existing policy

Introduction

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 2006-2007, the ninth year in which reviews have been conducted. Based on their reports, 659 tenured faculty were reviewed, of which 22, or 3.3%, were found “deficient” based on institutional criteria. This is an increase in number and percentage of faculty found deficient the previous year (13, 1.9%). The table on the following page includes information on the outcomes of post-tenure review reported by UNC campuses for nine years (1998-99 through 2006-07):

DRAFT

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

Year	Faculty Reviewed	Faculty Deficient	% Found Deficient
1998-1999	1,162	16	1.4%
1999-2000	914	42	4.6%
2000-2001	781	28	3.6%
2001-2002	690	29	4.2%
2002-2003	572	13	2.3%
2003-2004	1,106	23	2.1%
2004-2005	676	24	3.6%
2005-2006	690	13	1.9%
2006-2007	659	22	3.3%
8-Year Totals	7,250	210	2.9%

Follow-Up on Previous Reviews

Of the 13 faculty found deficient in 2005-2006, in the following year five had satisfactorily completed a plan for remediation, five were still engaged in following the requirements of such a plan, one had retired, one was dismissed, and one was assigned different responsibilities. Overall for 126 faculty members who were evaluated as “deficient” during the six-year period 2000-01 through 2005-06 and for whom outcomes were reported:

- 40 (31.7%) participated in a mandatory development plan and, when reviewed a second time, were evaluated as performing satisfactorily
- 26 (20.6%) continue to work under a mandatory development plan.
- 27 (21.4%) have retired.
- 16 (12.7%) had resigned.
- 15 (11.9%) had been dismissed.
- 2 (1.6%) was given an adjusted workload.