

400.3.3.1[G]
Adopted 06/24/97
Amended 00/00/08

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 6:02 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 pursuant to Policy 400.3.3 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 as follows: 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 develop policies and procedures for implementing post-tenure review. Institutions are encouraged to send a draft of their proposals for initial review by May 1, 1998. Proposals must be submitted no later than July 1, 1998. Implementation of approved policies will begin in the 1998-99 academic year, 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 October 1, 2008. Implementation of revised policies will be effective upon approval pursuant to Policy 400.3.3.
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.
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 to 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 time line 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 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.

[This is a rewrite of Administrative Memorandum #371.]

Approved.

Erskine B. Bowles, President

. 2008

Performance Review of Tenured Faculty

[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 entitled, "Post-Tenure Review in The University of North Carolina." These recommendations are contained herein. The full text of the report is available at UNC General Administration.]

Recommendations

1. That the system of post-tenure review in the University of North Carolina shall incorporate the following principles:
 - a. The purpose of the review 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.
 - b. The system of review will encompass and acknowledge the importance and significance of annual performance reviews while providing for comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review of the performance of all faculty whose primary professional responsibilities are teaching, research, and/or service.
 - c. The review procedure must provide for the evaluation over an appropriate period of time of all aspects of professional performance of faculty relative to the mission of the institution, college, and program. For each tenured faculty member, a cumulative review shall take place no less frequently than every five years. A review undertaken to grant tenure or to decide on promotion qualifies as such a cumulative review.
 - d. There must be peer involvement in the review.
 - e. The review process must include written feedback to the faculty member being reviewed as well as a mechanism for faculty response to the evaluation.
 - f. Institutional policies for post-tenure review must not abrogate, in any way, the criteria and procedures for due process and for discharge or other disciplinary action established in Chapter VI of *The Code* of the University.
 - g. While constituent institutions may wish to consider individual development or career plans for all faculty as a part of the review system, each performance review system must require such a plan for each faculty member receiving less than satisfactory ratings in the cumulative review. These individual development or career plans must include specific steps designed to lead to improvement, a specified time line in which improvement is expected to occur, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time line.
 - h. In proposing its policies, each constituent institution must consider the resources necessary to support and facilitate a meaningful review system and its outcomes.

2. That within the broad principles approved in 1. above, each constituent institution will develop policies and procedures for review that will reflect the mission of the institution. Development a system of post-tenure review will require re-examination of the effectiveness of current faculty personnel policies as well as planning and program review policies.
3. That institutions will have one year following the release of guidelines by General Administration to develop their policies and procedures.
4. That the policies and procedures developed by each constituent institution will be approved by the Board of Governors and included in appropriate documents of the constituent institutions.

Note: “Because of the unique character and mission of the University of North Carolina School of the Arts¹, the requirement that the institution adopt tenure policies will be satisfied at that institution based on renewable contracts. . .” (*The Code*). Therefore, the recommendations contained herein are not applicable to the North Carolina School of the Arts.

¹Name changed from North Carolina School of the Arts to University of North Carolina School of the Arts effective August 1, 2008.

Approved on February 9, 2009 by Faculty Senate: Motion FS 08-09/02-2 to approve changes to Section 4.3.3 – Post Tenure Review, which brings Handbook in accordance with UNC Code.

Current:

4.3.3 Post-Tenure Review

4.3.3.1 All teaching faculty with tenure must undergo a post-tenure review process every five years. The Board of Governors adopted the report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review at its meeting on May 16, 1997. A copy of that report (as well as Administrative Memorandum Number 371 regarding "Performance Review of Tenured Faculty," which contains guidelines for performance of post-tenure reviews) is available from the Office of Academic Affairs. Post-tenure review is defined 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."

Proposed:

4.3.3 Post-Tenure Review

4.3.3.1 Post-tenure review is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to support and encourage faculty excellence. Post tenure review requirements can be found in the UNC Policy Manual: 400.3.3.1[G].

Proposed New Sections:

4.3.3.2 In addition to the annual review for all faculty, described in Section 4.3.2, each tenured member of the teaching faculty will be subject to a comprehensive, cumulative review on a regular and systematic basis, 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.) This comprehensive review 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 in one or two of these areas, post-tenure review and resulting recommendations should take this allocation of responsibilities into account. Faculty performance will be examined relative to the mission of the University, college, and program. Exemplary faculty performance will be recognized and rewarded. Because performance rewards are often part of the annual review process (described in Section 4.3.2), the post-tenure review may provide additional support for this form of recognition.

4.3.3.3 A post-tenure review committee for a department or academic unit will be elected by a vote of the tenured faculty in the department or academic unit. The faculty member being reviewed will not have the option of selecting members of the peer review committee. The tenured faculty will elect from among themselves three tenured faculty, who will serve staggered, non-renewable, three-year terms. In the initial election, one tenured faculty member will be elected for a one-year term, one for a two-year term, and one for a three-year term. After the initial election, the tenured faculty will elect one tenured faculty member to fill a vacancy each year. The tenured faculty may also fill vacancies caused by resignation or other contingencies. In the event that there are not three tenured faculty in the department or academic unit, the tenured faculty will make nominations and will elect from among those nominated a tenured faculty member or members from an allied discipline to serve on the peer review committee. The review of the committee as well as the recommendations of the department chair will be reviewed by the Dean. (In cases where the Dean functions as a department

chair in an academic unit without departmental divisions, the higher administrative review will be performed by the Provost.)

4.3.3.4 The post-tenure review committee shall provide to the faculty member being reviewed and the departmental chair written feedback concerning its evaluation and will designate the faculty member's performance as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or exemplary. The faculty member under review may provide a written response to the evaluation. The post-tenure review committee's feedback should include recognition for exemplary performance. All reviews must include a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and delineate specific strengths and weaknesses as they relate to the faculty member's performance of assigned duties. A faculty member's response, if any, to the committee's review will also be forwarded to and reviewed by the Dean.

4.3.3.5 After review by the Dean, any faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory rating in the post-tenure review will be given the opportunity to improve performance. The faculty member's chair will: (a) consider the written feedback from the post-tenure review committee and the faculty member; and (b) prepare a written individual professional development plan for the faculty member. A specific timeline including steps for improvement must be included in the development plan, with a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time line [Consequences may include discharge or demotion for "sustained unsatisfactory performance" after the faculty member has been given an opportunity to remedy such performance and fails to do so within a reasonable time, pursuant to Section 3.8.1.1 of the *Faculty Handbook*.] The chair is encouraged to assign one or more mentoring peers to the faculty member, and the chair must hold a progress meeting with the faculty member on at least a semi-annual basis during the specified time line. If the faculty member's duties are modified as a result of a less than satisfactory rating, the development plan should indicate and take into account the new allocation of responsibilities.

Post-Tenure Review Policy for North Carolina Central University

Preface:

“Excellence without Excuses” is the continuing standard for all academic programs at North Carolina Central University. The strength and vitality of the faculty is the essence of the University’s commitment to excellence in teaching. Accordingly, as mandated by the General Administration, post-tenure review (PTR) will be the vehicle used to help assure the continuation of a strong and productive faculty whose services meet and exceed standards of excellence.

The policy provides a clear plan and timetable for improvement of tenured faculty found deficient; and for those whose performance remains deficient, it provides for the imposition of appropriate sanctions. Such sanctions may, in the most serious cases, include a recommendation for discharge. The PTR is a faculty-based review process that is designed to guide and reinforce the continued development of tenured faculty who, by virtue of their experience, growth and professional standing, are expected to set the performance standards for scholarly productivity for the academic units.

The PTR plan is carefully crafted to assure that it reflects NCCU’s mission, which is:

“to prepare students academically and professionally to become leaders prepared to advance the consciousness of social responsibility in a diverse, global society. The University will serve its traditional clientele of African American students; it will also expand its commitment to meet the educational needs of a student body that is diverse in race and other socioeconomic attributes.”

Basic Elements of the PTR Policy:

The PTR Policy identifies specific areas of strength among tenured faculty as well as areas requiring more concentrated development. The PTR process will rely on a summative, retrospective view of five years of the professor’s professional activities that may underscore trends not immediately obvious in the customary annual faculty evaluation process.

The PTR Policy will not supplant but will extend and build upon existing University rules governing appointments, reappointments, tenure, and promotions. Such functions are largely relegated to the department management level for the College of Arts and Science, the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, the College of Liberal Arts, at the dean’s levels for the other academic degree granting agencies inclusive of the Schools of Law, Business, Education, and Library and information Science, and at the chair level in the Department of Nursing. The PTR is linked to the existing faculty evaluation process which, in turn is linked to the faculty development process.

The policy for the faculty evaluation requires all faculty, including part-time and temporary faculty, to be evaluated annually. It specifically directs department chairpersons (or deans in schools with no department structure) to require all teaching faculty to present objective data on the extent to which they are fulfilling college/school and departmental goals regarding teaching, research, and service. The system further stipulates that, for each fall and spring term, students will evaluate faculty on all courses taught. In sum, departmental chairpersons (or deans in schools with no departmental structure) are responsible for evaluating each faculty member every year and it is expected that the result of the evaluation will be used to guide faculty members' professional development goals and needs.

For the purposes of PTR, department chairpersons and deans in schools with no department structure will establish a standing Post Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) that will be comprised of tenured faculty in their respective departments/schools. All PTR committees must have at least three members all of whom must have at least three years of teaching experience at NCCU. In the instances where departments/schools do not have the requisite number of faculty qualified to sit on a PTRC, the chair/dean, must recruit the sufficient number of qualified persons from related academic areas within the University.

PTR is required of all tenured faculty whose primary responsibilities (51% or more) are teaching and/or research and/or service. It shall be the responsibility of the Provost/VCAA to notify unit administrators and affected faculty when to complete the PTR document. When a department chair is scheduled for a PTR, it shall be the responsibility of the Dean to fulfill the notification requirements, select an appropriate PTRC and generally manage the PTR process.

Establishment of the Post Tenure Review Committee and Role of the Unit Head

1. The tenured faculty members in the department will select 3 tenured faculty members to serve on the Post Tenure Review Committee (PTRC).
2. Faculty members to be reviewed are not allowed to participate in the selection of committee members.
3. The chair of the PTRC is selected by the membership of the committee.
4. The PTRC reviews the faculty dossier and writes its report.
5. The chair of the PTRC sends the written report to the unit head for review.
6. The unit head (department chair, lead professor, section chair) reviews the report and after consultation with the dean, sends a written response (including the report) to the faculty.
7. In case of a deficient report, the unit head will review the report, consult with the dean, and then make a recommendation to the faculty for improvement in the form of a development plan.
8. The report to the faculty includes a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of the deficiency as they relate to the faculty member's assigned duties.
9. The report to the faculty will include the sanctions which will result if the terms of the plan are not realized.
10. In the event the unit head is being reviewed, the report of the PTRC will go directly to the dean for review and response.
11. The terms of the contract must be consistent with the CODE of the University of North Carolina
12. Faculty members will have ten (10) business days to respond to the report after receiving it from the unit head.

PTR Evaluation Timetables, Procedures and Processes:

1. Faculty for whom PTR is required must undergo a review no later the fifth academic year following the most recent of the following review events: (1) awarding of tenure at NCCU and (2) prior post-tenure review at NCCU.
2. The effective start date of the PTR is August 1, 1998 according to the UNC System General Administration and the Board of Governors. The review process is repeated at five-year intervals for each tenured faculty.

Exceptions:

- a. A period when a faculty member is on leave from professional duties shall not be included as part of the five years mandatory review events. In such cases, the five-year clock stops with the leave but continues when the faculty member resumes his/her teaching duties.
 - b. PTR is not required of a faculty member who has officially set an irrevocable retirement or resignation within the next 12 months.
3. For PTR purposes, the term “faculty” refers to persons on a nine- or twelve month or longer contract whose primary responsibilities (51% or more) are teaching and/or research and/or service.
 4. Post Tenure Review does not replace a review for purposes of promotion. Rather, successful evaluations for the purpose of promotion satisfy the requirement of post-tenure review.
 5. For the first year of implementation of the NCCU PTR policy (1998-1999), twenty percent (20%) of the faculty furthest removed from the date of their last comprehensive review (for tenure and/or for promotion) will be identified by the Provost/VCAA on or before October 15 as the first review cohort subject to the terms of the Post Tenure Review Policy. Individual appointments for evaluation will be set for the spring term of 1999. The Provost/VCAA will initiate the process with written notification to the appropriate unit heads. The unit heads will then form PTRC’s and notify the selected tenured faculty. The notice will request that they begin to assemble a five-year dossier for the purpose of post tenure review. The unit heads will serve as facilitators and conveners. Reviews beginning in 1999-2000 will provide notice during the spring term for evaluation during the ensuing fall term.
 6. The evaluation will be performed by unit-specific Post-Tenure Review Committees. The policy stipulates that all tenured faculty will be reviewed at five-year intervals based primarily upon documents accumulated via their respective units’ annual evaluations. Accordingly, preparatory to PTR, faculty are required to participate in NCCU’s customary annual evaluations. Faculty who refuse to participate in these annual evaluations, regardless of intent or circumstances, will receive a single written warning from the Provost/VCAA before the end of the semester in which the

infraction occurred. If the infraction, in whole or in part, is repeated any other time the faculty will be severely sanctioned or dismissed from service at or before his/her next PTR.

7. The Post Tenure Review Committee will review five-year dossiers containing documents from several sources, in summary form, drawn from the faculty's standard evaluations. In instances where unit heads are to be reviewed, the deans or their designees (who must be the most senior tenured member of the unit) will assume the duties of the chair of the committee. The faculty member's five-year dossier is assembled by the faculty member with assistance from his/her chair and submitted to the PTRC in a time frame consistent with that prescribed by the Provost/VCAA.

Results of Post-Tenure Review:

1. All PTR's should begin no later than January 15th and the final reports will be submitted no later than March 1st of any given calendar year to the VCAA's office.
2. The faculty member has the right to challenge any of the contents of the PTRC's report by following procedures described in the NCCU Faculty Handbook regarding faculty governance and grievances. Such challenges must be in written form and sent to the VCAA.
3. The PTRC is advisory to the Chair, Dean, and Provost/VCAA. The PTRC can make only one of two recommendations: (a) the faculty "passes" review, performing at an adequate or superior level or (b) the faculty has deficient performance that will require more concentrated development efforts.

In the former case, PTRC submits its conclusions to the Chair or Dean along with recommendations, if warranted, for rewards and recognition for the member's exemplary performance. Such rewards could include one or a combination of the following: teaching awards, increase in salary (not to exceed the upper limit allowed for full professors by GA), funding for ongoing or planned research, released time for writing, research, travel or for special services projects that will enhance the professor's professional stature and NCCU's services or image.

In the latter case where deficiencies are found, the faculty member will be directed to draft a professional development plan in consultation with his or her unit head, who will then consult with the assembled tenured departmental faculty on the quality of the plan and the ability of the faculty member to execute it within an approved timeline.

The Development Plan

The faculty who has deficiencies in the report will draw up a Development Plan which should include the following.

1. Specific steps designed to lead to improvement and specific timelines to eliminate the deficiencies outlined in the written report from the unit head
2. The faculty member must include what improvements she/he will make.
3. The development plan must be submitted to the unit head.
4. The timeline should not be less than 2-years or more than three.
5. A progress review of the development plan (by the department chair) must be done semi-annually

The plan will indicate when the faculty member is to be reviewed again by an appointed PTRC. The faculty member will be given a period of not less than two years and not more than three years to demonstrably remove the cited deficient performances areas. If the PTRC concludes that the deficiencies have not been corrected after the final review, the faculty member may be seriously sanctioned or discharged in conformity with the terms of the Code (See Sections 602 (Academic Tenure) and 603 (Due Process)). Before implementation of any serious sanction against a member of the faculty, the Provost/VCAA will consult with the PTRC.

The Role of the Dean

The dean submits a written report to the Provost which includes the following.

1. Names and numbers of persons reviewed
2. Names and number of faculty who passed the review and the number and names of those who had deficiencies.
3. Status of the faculty reviewed in the past two years
4. Progress of faculty who are following a development plan.

Any sanctions imposed on faculty members for continuing deficiency in performance will be in accordance with the UNC Code (See sections 602-academic tenure, and 603-due process).

Respectfully Submitted by NCCU Faculty Senate, August 15, 1998 **and revised in 2009.**

NCCU Committee of Post Tenure Review (1998):

Dr. Ted Parish, Chair, Health Education

Dr. Ben Speller, Dean, School of Library and Information Sciences

Dr. John Harrington, Modern Foreign Languages

Dr. Tom Evans, English Department

Dr. James Beckwith, Law School

Atty. Kaye Webb, Office of Legal Affairs

Dr. Les Brinson, Psychology, NCCU Faculty Senate Chair and PTR Committee Chair

NC STATE UNIVERSITY
Policies, Regulations and Rules

Authority	Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
Title	Post Tenure Review of Faculty
Classification	REG05.20.4
PRR Subject	Employment - EPA
Contact Info	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (919-513-7741)

History: First Issued: Fall 1998. Last Revised: November 21, 2008. Additional History Information.

Draft includes revisions recommended after review by UNC General Administration staff.

Related Policies:

NCSU POL05.20.1 - Academic Tenure Policy

NCSU POL05.25.1 – Grievance Procedure for Faculty

UNC Policy 400.3.3 - Performance Review of Tenured Faculty

UNC Policy 400.3.3.1[G] - Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty

NCSU REG05.20.20. - Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Dossier Format Requirements

NCSU REG05.20.13 - Joint and Associate Faculty Appointments

Additional References:

Promotion and Tenure Departmental Standards and Procedures

---will add a link to the Departmental Rules here---

1. INTRODUCTION

This regulation establishes procedures for comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review of the performance of all tenured faculty. This regulation meets the requirements of UNC Policy 400.3.3. Performance Review of Tenured Faculty and UNC Policy 400.3.3.1[G] Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty.

The purpose of this regulation is to establish procedures to ensure that post-tenure review is conducted in a manner that protects academic freedom and the quality of education. These procedures further ensure that post-tenure review is not a reevaluation of tenure, nor may it be used to shift the burden of proof from the administration to faculty peers to show cause for dismissal, or to the individual faculty member to show cause why he or she should be retained.

2. FREQUENCY

2.1 Every tenured faculty member shall be reviewed through the post tenure review process every five years after having been tenured. Exceptions may be granted at the discretion of the Dean for faculty members who have submitted a letter of intent to retire, resign or apply for the Phased Retirement Program to be effective within two years from July 1 of the academic year of their review. An extension of up to one year may be granted at the discretion of the Dean when circumstances place an undue burden on the faculty member and/or department to complete the review during the fifth year.

2.2 A positive Departmental Voting Faculty vote for promotion (as defined by a simple majority vote) shall be considered a 'meets expectations' for post tenure review regardless of the outcome of the promotion process. A negative vote for promotion by the Departmental Voting Faculty does not qualify as a post tenure review and does not change the faculty member's post tenure review schedule.

2.3 If a post tenure review finds that the faculty member meets expectations, the next post tenure review shall not occur in fewer than five years. However, pursuant to Academic Tenure Policy POL05.20.1 section 6.6.5. academic administration may schedule a review with peer involvement when deemed appropriate.

3. DEPARTMENTAL RULES

Individual departments shall have Departmental Rules describing the standards and procedures used to carry out post tenure review. The Departmental Rules shall include the composition of the peer review committee and a procedure to select the committee by a process agreed upon by the tenured faculty in that unit. These Departmental Rules shall be supplemental to and consistent with this regulation.

4. JOINT APPOINTMENTS

Reviews of faculty with joint appointments shall be conducted in each department according to duly established Departmental Rules developed within each department.

For peer reviews, the Department Head of the primary department will add the votes from the respective reviews to determine results per Section 5.4 and inform the other head(s)/chair(s) and dean(s) for the departments involved. For college and university reports, the results will be reported only once by the primary department.

If the faculty member has requested and been approved for an administrative review (see Section 5.3), the Department Head of the primary department must consult with the other head(s) or chair(s) for the departments involved.

Departments not having primary responsibility for a faculty member with a joint appointment have the option of not conducting a post tenure review. The circumstances of when a department chooses to exercise this option are to be stipulated in the Department Rules.

5. PROCEDURES

Post tenure review shall be conducted according to the following procedures:

5.1 As part of the annual review process the Department Head will inform each faculty member of the projected date of their next post tenure review.

5.2 To assess faculty member's cumulative performance, the following materials or documents with equivalent content shall be provided to the review committee:

5.2.1 A current CV

5.2.2 The Statement of Mutual Expectations

5.2.3 Each annual activity report since the last review.

5.2.4 Peer teaching evaluations since the last review.

5.2.5 An optional 2-page candidate statement.

5.3 A peer review committee ~~The review shall be conducted by a peer review committee~~ selected in accordance with Departmental Rules. According to UNC Policy 400.3.3.1[G] - Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, the faculty member being reviewed will not have the option of selecting members of the peer review committee.

5.4 The faculty member to be reviewed may request an administrative review to be conducted by the Department Head. All requests for administrative review must be approved by the peer review committee. The department head will communicate the results of all administrative reviews to the peer review committee. In the event of a negative administrative review, an evaluation by the peer review committee shall be conducted within the same review period. All subsequent evaluations responding to a negative review must be conducted by the faculty peer review committee.

5.54 The post tenure review will provide a comprehensive, cumulative, written assessment to determine whether the tenured faculty member *meets* or *does not meet* the performance standards, as defined in Departmental Rules, for the realms of responsibility described in the Statement of Mutual Expectations of the faculty member undergoing post tenure review.—The determination of *meets* or *does not meet* expectations shall be based on a simple majority vote of the peer review committee. A tie vote shall be understood to *meet* expectations.

5.65 The Department Head shall provide to the faculty member being reviewed the written assessment of the review including the numerical vote (vote not applicable for an administrative review) as well as an option for a written faculty response to the evaluation which becomes part of the review record. The Department Head shall discuss the post tenure review report and optional faculty member response with the faculty member.

5.76 If the result is that the faculty member's performance *meets* expectations, the review is concluded. The documentation and findings of the review should be taken into account in the determination of appropriate rewards, such as annual salary increases, nomination for awards and other recognitions.

5.87 If the result is that the faculty member's performance *does not meet* expectations, the Department Head will prepare a written development plan in conjunction with the faculty member and relevant peers in the department that prescribes what the faculty member must do to meet expectations in the following year(s) including specific descriptions of shortcomings and areas for improvement as they relate to the realms of responsibility described in the faculty member's Statement of Mutual Expectations. The plan will serve as the basis for the subsequent review. Reviews by the peer review committee will be conducted annually until such time as the faculty member is found to *meet expectations*.

5.87.1 The individual development plan must include specific expectations, actions and consequences designed to lead to improvement, and a specified time line in which improvement is expected to occur.

5.87.2 The Department Head shall meet with the faculty member at least twice annually to assess progress toward meeting the development plan. There will be a written summary of these meetings provided to the faculty member and placed in their personnel file.

5.78.3 A peer mentor shall be assigned to meet with the faculty member at least twice annually to facilitate progress toward meeting the development plan. There will be a written summary of each of these meetings provided to the faculty member and placed in their personnel file.

5.87.4 When reviewing the progress toward meeting the development plan, the annual review by the peer review committee shall determine:

5.87.4.1 Is the faculty member meeting (or not) the expected progress of the development plan?

5.87.4.2 Does the faculty member now *meet expectations* of the performance standards for the realms of responsibility described in their Statement of Mutual Expectations?

The response to these shall be communicated to the Department Head to be taken into account in the annual performance evaluation of the candidate. If the faculty member meets expectations 5.87.4.1 and 5.78.4.2 the post tenure review is complete.

6. REPORTING AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

6.1. The outcome of the review shall be provided to the dean, including recommendations for any administrative action. In cases resulting in *does not meet* expectations, the Department Head will send a copy of all annual reviews conducted during the period of the post tenure review to the Dean along with the results and assessment report by the Post Tenure Review Committee, the faculty member's response to the review, and recommendations for any administrative action.

6.2. The dean shall review the information provided by the Head per section 6.1 and provide to the provost an acknowledgment of the completion of the post-tenure review and the dean's recommendations for any administrative action.

6.3 A negative post tenure review decision may be grieved in accordance with procedures set forth in the Faculty Grievance Procedure.

6.4 For faculty members whose performance does not meet expectations for multiple consecutive years, the post-tenure review process may support an administrative action under the University's existing disciplinary procedures.

6.5 This regulation does not preclude an administrative judgment of professional performance at any time based on evaluations other than post tenure review.

Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)

CONTENTS

Purpose
Policy
Procedures
Records

Purpose

The following post-tenure review policy provides a framework for implementation of the Trustee Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty, which was first effective September 1, 1998 and amended effective _____, 20089.

Post-tenure review is a systematic process for the periodic, comprehensive review of the performance of all faculty members having permanent tenure and whose primary duties are teaching, research and/or service. The goals of post-tenure review are to promote faculty development, ensure faculty productivity and provide accountability. The post-tenure review process should respect the basic principles of academic freedom. Post-tenure review does not abrogate, in any way, the due process criteria or procedures for dismissal or other disciplinary action established under the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure. The policies and procedures presented below incorporate the basic principles of the policies established by the Board of Governors in Sections 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1 of the UNC Policy Manual.

Policy

Each faculty member is subject to post-tenure review no less often than every five years following the conferral of permanent tenure. Reviews must examine all aspects of a faculty member's academic performance and must involve faculty peers. While annual performance reviews may inform the post-tenure review process, they are not a substitute for a comprehensive post-tenure review. Comprehensive evaluations conducted for other purposes, such as a review for promotion, may be substituted for or combined with post-tenure review. A review may be delayed for compelling reasons approved by the Provost.

Procedures

The unit head shall notify a faculty member at least six months in advance of an upcoming post-tenure review.

Each appointing unit has developed written policies and procedures that describe the expectations the unit has of its faculty, the manner in which the post-tenure review process is conducted, and the procedures by which persons will be designated to conduct reviews. In the remainder of this document the designated persons will be referred to as the Post-Tenure Review Committee. The review process must involve faculty peers and should be conducted by a minimum of three persons. The faculty member being reviewed shall not participate in the selection of members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee. The post-tenure review process should be flexible enough to acknowledge different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers.

The review should involve an examination of qualitative and quantitative evidence of all relevant aspects of a faculty member's professional performance over at least the previous five years in relation to the mission of the department, school and institution. If a faculty member's responsibilities do not include teaching, research and public service, but instead focus primarily on one or two of these areas, the review shall take this allocation of responsibilities into account. Each faculty member being reviewed should provide a concise summary of accomplishments and plans. Additional evidence for the review may include annual merit reviews, a current curriculum vita, copies of publications, evaluations of teaching, and other documentation of contributions and accomplishments.

The Post-Tenure Review Committee will consult with the academic unit head and provide to the faculty member and the unit head a written summary of its conclusions with regard to the faculty member's overall performance and, where appropriate, its recommendations.

The faculty member being reviewed must be given an opportunity by the unit head to provide a written response to the report of the Post-Tenure Review Committee. The unit head maintains a record of the Committee's report and any response to it as a part of the faculty member's confidential personnel file within the unit. The report and any response shall also be reviewed by the administrative officer to whom the unit head reports. When the unit head is being reviewed, the administrative officer at the next higher level assumes the function of the unit head in the review process and the report of the Post-Tenure Review Committee and any response shall be reviewed by the administrative officer to whom that individual reports.

The post-tenure review process should identify and recognize outstanding performance by faculty members. The process may also identify specific areas in which faculty members can improve and, in such cases, the process should result in specific recommendations and plans for improvement. For faculty members whose overall performance reflects substantial deficiencies, the report of the Post-Tenure Review Committee shall include a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities, specific descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member's assigned duties, and a more comprehensive plan for improvement (a development plan) should be prepared.

Development plans should be established jointly by the faculty member being reviewed and the unit head on the basis of the evaluation and recommendations provided by the Post-Tenure Review Committee. Faculty development plans should be individualized and flexible, taking into account the faculty member's intellectual interests, abilities, and career stage, as well as needs of the unit and institution. The development plan should describe changes, if any, to be made in the faculty member's teaching, research, and/or service responsibilities, establish clear goals, specify steps designed to achieve those goals, define indicators of goal attainment, establish a clear and reasonable time frame for the completion of goals, identify any resources available for implementation of the plan, and state the consequences of failure to attain the goals. The use of mentoring peers is encouraged, and progress meetings with the academic unit head must occur on at least a semi-annual basis during the specified time frame. Annual reviews should also be used to assess progress toward goals specified in the plan. The unit head should acknowledge in writing a faculty member's clear improvement and the successful completion of a development plan.

A faculty member whose overall performance has been found to show substantial deficiencies and for whom a development plan has been recommended will have the right to appeal the findings of the Post-Tenure Review Committee and the recommendation for a development plan to the dean or next higher level administrative officer beyond the unit head. ~~whose decision shall be final.~~

In the case of a faculty member who fails to complete a development plan successfully and whose performance continues to be deficient, the unit head should notify the dean, who will consider whether grounds for dismissal or other disciplinary action exist under the *Trustees Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure*. Dismissal or severe sanction may be imposed only in accordance with and on the grounds stated in the *Trustees Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure*.

- Faculty members may grieve matters related to post-tenure review to the Faculty Grievance Committee under Section 607 of the Code of the University of North Carolina during their term of employment.
-



Records

Copies of each unit's post-tenure review procedures, as revised from time to time, will be filed with the dean or Provost, as appropriate. Unit heads will maintain a list of the faculty members reviewed each year, a record of completed reviews and responses to the reviews, the names of all faculty members for whom a development plan was recommended, and a copy of the development plans. Deans will file annual reports to the Office of the Provost giving the following information:

- Names of faculty members reviewed during the previous year,
- Names of faculty members for whom a development plan was recommended and established, and
- Names of faculty who are subject to review, but for whom a delay was approved by the Provost along with the compelling reasons for the delay.

**POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO**

<http://provost.uncg.edu/documents/personnel/posttenurereview.pdf>

(Approved by the Faculty Senate, September 2, 1998;
(Amended by the Faculty Senate, November 30, 2005);
(Approved by the Board of Trustees, September 4, 1998;
(Amended by the Board of Trustees, April 5, 2006);
(Approved by the Board of Governors, September 11, 1998);
(Amended by the Faculty Senate, September 3, 2008);
(Approved by the Board of Trustees, September 18, 2008);
(Approved by the Board of Governors, date)

INTRODUCTION

The Faculty Welfare and Professional Development Committee has been given the task of developing the criteria for Post-Tenure Review (PTR). The purpose of this report is to provide a framework for developing the criteria to be used for evaluating performance of tenured faculty as part of the PTR process for faculty growth and development. The report is based on the guidelines adopted by the Board of Governors in the report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review (Administrative Memorandum #371) and was written after a review of similar documents from other universities in the UNC system. The PTR process is designed to enhance individual efforts and to relate these efforts to the goals of academic units and the University through annual and cumulative reviews.

DEFINITION AND PURPOSE

The definition of PTR according to the Administrative Memorandum is: "a comprehensive, formal periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality."

The purpose of PTR is to:

1. Sustain and facilitate excellence among tenured faculty by recognizing, encouraging, and rewarding faculty performance.
2. Foster faculty development in the areas of teaching, research, service, and directed professional activity by evaluating all aspects of professional performance and by acknowledging progress in specific areas and identifying specific activities which can be undertaken if improvement is needed.

POLICY

Post-Tenure Review is required of all tenured faculty. Building on annual reviews, PTR is a cumulative evaluation of faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. An additional category, directed professional activity, may be used by a unit as a fourth category of evaluation if appropriate (see UNCG Evaluation Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure). The cumulative review shall take place no

less frequently than every five years and must provide for the evaluation of all aspects of faculty performance during this period relative to the mission of the unit and institution. Reviews of faculty within a unit (department within the College of Arts and Sciences or Professional Schools, or entire School or Library in cases of no division into departments) will be the responsibility of the unit head, although the review must involve peers. Yearly and cumulative reviews of unit heads will be conducted by the deans (or provost, in cases in which the dean serves as the unit head) and evaluations of the deans by the provost. The PTR policy respects the basic principles of academic freedom and must not abrogate, in any way, the criteria and procedures for due process and for dismissal or other disciplinary action established in accordance with the *UNCG Handbook for Faculty* and Chapter VI of *The Code of the University*.

THE POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

Starting in the 1998-1999 academic year, each unit must institute a written annual review process if it does not currently have one and conduct cumulative reviews of some faculty. Five-year cumulative reviews and annual reviews take place at the unit level.

- I. **Annual Reviews.** Written annual reviews should reflect how faculty promote the goals of their unit and the mission of the University. The responsibility for developing criteria and procedures for evaluation of tenured faculty performance rests with each academic unit. The criteria must consider individual faculty profiles and special contributions as well as the faculty member's accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, and service. If faculty responsibilities are primarily only to one or two of these areas, post-tenure review and resulting recommendations should take this allocation of responsibilities into account. Directed professional activity may also serve as a category of evaluation. The faculty member must receive written feedback within a reasonable amount of time following the conclusion of each review. Each faculty member must be given an opportunity to respond formally to the review. The annual review process should include:
 - A. **The UNCG Report Form.** The UNCG Report Form for University faculty must be used, but individual units are free to modify the form to fit their specific needs. Each unit must establish its own criteria for performance. Faculty members must complete the UNCG Report Form, including a written summary of objectives and accomplishments, and may include supporting materials. In cases of disagreement between the unit head and faculty member on objectives and accomplishments, the head shall provide a faculty member with a written statement of the head's specific reasons for disagreeing with any or all of the objectives and accomplishments.
 - B. **Significant peer review.** Significant peer review is defined as involving a committee composed of three or more tenured faculty members, but the unit head shall not be a member of the committee. 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~~ The review outcome in an academic unit must be reviewed at one or more higher administration levels. The committee is charged with conducting a five- year cumulative review (see II. below). However, if a faculty member requests significant peer review for his or her annual review evaluation, then this request shall be granted. The composition of the

committee should be determined at the unit level. The unit head (and the review committee, when applicable) must evaluate the annual report and decide into which category each faculty member is to be placed (i.e., exemplary, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory) based upon the faculty member's overall performance in the areas of teaching, research, service, and directed professional activity (when applicable). Within the context of the annual review, the category of satisfactory may, but need not, be divided into additional evaluative sub-categories, e.g., fair, good, and very good. If the review committee's decision is not unanimous, any dissenting member of the review committee may include a letter of dissent, to be made available to the faculty member and kept in his or her file. The evaluation process should take into account the objectives that each faculty member establishes at the beginning of the current year and any dissenting letters or faculty response letters from prior years in the current five-year cycle. Faculty members may add further documentation in support of their teaching, research, service, or directed professional activity if they so wish.

- C. The end of year report. The end of year report will state whether the faculty member's overall performance for the year is exemplary, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory and will include a written summary of the year's achievements from the unit head and the peer review committee (when applicable) with recommendations for rewards or improvement as appropriate. Disagreements between the unit head and the peer review committee will be resolved by the dean or provost (in cases in which the dean serves as the unit head).

- II. *Five Year Cumulative Review.* The cumulative review prepared by the unit head, dean, or provost summarizes the annual reports of a faculty member's progression of work and occurs at least once every five years. The cumulative review, which incorporates the annual review for the year in which the cumulative review takes place, should include a summary evaluation of all aspects of the professional performance of a faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, service, and directed professional activity (when applicable). If faculty responsibilities are primarily only to one or two of these areas, post-tenure review and resulting recommendations should take this allocation of responsibilities into account. The cumulative review will categorize a faculty member's overall professional performance as being either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. For the purposes of the cumulative review, the category of satisfactory will not be subdivided into further evaluative sub-categories. Significant peer review is a necessary part of the cumulative review process. It involves a review committee of three or more tenured faculty charged with conducting a cumulative review, but the unit head is not a member of the committee. The faculty member being reviewed will not have the option of selecting members of the review committee. The department chair or academic unit head must consult with the peer review committee. Post-tenure review outcome in an academic unit must be reviewed at one or more higher administration levels. The faculty member must receive written feedback within a reasonable amount of time following the conclusion of each review. Disagreements between the unit head and the peer review committee on the content of the cumulative review report will be resolved by the dean or provost (in cases in which the dean serves as unit head). An unsatisfactory cumulative review can only occur if there have been at least two unsatisfactory annual reviews in the current PTR cycle.

If, in a given academic year, a tenured faculty member scheduled for cumulative review is recommended for promotion through the first and second levels of promotion-review, then that faculty member will be deemed to have had a satisfactory cumulative review;¹ there is no need to do a separate cumulative review in addition to the promotion-review. Otherwise, the faculty member in question will undergo a [separate] cumulative review. However, any tenured faculty

¹ Note that the two levels of promotion-review in question may not be the same in a non-departmentalized unit as in a departmentalized unit.

member who is promoted in the same academic year as his or her cumulative review will be deemed to have had a satisfactory cumulative review.

Each faculty member must be given an opportunity to respond formally to the post tenure review.

- III. **Rewards.** Annual reviews should recognize, encourage, and reward exemplary performance by means of special recognition such as:
1. Nomination for awards
 2. Merit increases
 3. Research leaves
 4. Revisions of work load

- IV. **Unsatisfactory cumulative review.** A negative review must include a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of shortcoming as they relate to the faculty member's assigned duties. Each faculty member must be given an opportunity to respond formally to the review. Faculty response to a negative review, if any, will also be shared at the next highest administrative level. In cases of an unsatisfactory cumulative review, the following procedures must be implemented:

- A. The unit head, dean, or provost shall complete and sign a form declaring that the faculty member has an unsatisfactory cumulative review. This form documents the specific reasons why the faculty member has been given an unsatisfactory cumulative review. Each of the relevant areas of performance must be addressed. A copy of this form shall be forwarded to the faculty member, dean, and peer evaluators. The unit head must, in consultation with the dean or provost, peer evaluators, and the individual faculty member, draft a plan with specific steps, specified resources as appropriate, and a time line for reasonable improvement, allowing a maximum of three years.

- B. The plan must include a written statement of the consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time line.

- C. A copy of this document is provided to the faculty member and another copy placed in the faculty member's file.

- D. The use of mentoring peers is encouraged.

- ~~C.E.~~ Progress meetings with the department chair or academic unit head must occur on at least a semi-annual basis during the 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.

- ~~D.F.~~ If a faculty member fails to meet the expected levels of improvement in performance stated in the plan, then the unit head may sign a formal document declaring the faculty member to be professionally deficient and recommend to the ~~Chancellor~~ Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs that the faculty member be discharged or subjected to other disciplinary action, as established in Chapter VI of *The Code of the University*. The only admissible grounds for such a recommendation by the unit head in this context are incompetence or neglect of duty, as consistent with Chapter VI of *The Code of the University* and *UNCG Handbook for Faculty*.

- E.G. The College, the Schools, and the Library shall each create a College, School, or Library committee of tenured faculty members called the Committee on Post-Tenure Review

whose charge is to review and approve plans for improvement of faculty who receive unsatisfactory cumulative reviews. Such a review will occur if and only if a faculty member appeals the initial plan. Both the faculty member and unit head may provide additional documentary evidence to the committee. Disagreements between the unit head and the Committee on Post-Tenure Review will be resolved by the dean or provost (in cases in which the dean serves as unit head).

FG. If the unit head recommends to the Chancellor that the faculty member be discharged or subjected to other disciplinary action as established in Section 7 of the ~~Academic Freedom, Tenure and Due Process Regulations~~ *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations*, then the following process of review shall be initiated. First, the unit head's recommendation shall be reviewed by the tenured faculty in that unit of the rank specified in Section 3.G of the ~~Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Due Process Regulations~~ *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations*. Such a recommendation shall be further reviewed in the following order: College, School, or Library Committee on Promotions and Tenure; Dean; University Committee on Promotions and Tenure; Provost; and Chancellor. The University has the burden of proof in justifying the recommendation in question; the standard of proof to be used throughout the stages of this review is that of clear and convincing evidence. Both the faculty member and unit head may provide additional documentary evidence to the reviewing entities. The recommendations at each level of review shall be forwarded, together with all of the documentary evidence and all of the prior recommendations, to the next level of review.

TIMETABLE

PTR is to be first implemented in the 1998-1999 academic year. This time frame will require that all faculty undergo annual review by the end of that academic year and that some faculty undergo cumulative review. Each unit will provide to the provost a list of faculty members to be reviewed. To avoid reviewing all tenured faculty at once, in the initial cumulative review year and every five years thereafter, units may decide to conduct cumulative reviews on the anniversary of the faculty member's most recent tenure/promotion review that is divisible by five, or units may review first those tenured faculty members with the longest accrued time since the last formal evaluation for tenure or promotion. Large units should review approximately 20 percent of eligible faculty every year. This process would eliminate any undue burden on units by staggering the cumulative review cycle.

department chair's administrative performance, input from other administrators, and input from faculty, as well as documentation submitted by the department chair.

4-10.B Evaluation of Chair's Departmental Administrative Responsibilities

Department chairs' administrative responsibilities are taken into account by the Dean as part of the department chairs' annual evaluation, although formal faculty assessments are not collected each year. Departmental chairs' administrative responsibilities are assessed as part of the procedure for renewable terms for department chairs (Faculty Handbook, Section 10-6.C). Briefly, chairs are evaluated by the Office for Academic Affairs in the second year of service as chair. At this time, the Dean will seek input from the faculty concerning performance of the chair's administrative responsibilities and will distribute evaluation forms (e.g., Figure, Section 4-12.H) to each full-time faculty member in the department. The forms will be returned directly to the Dean.

4-10.C Evaluations for Tenure and/or Promotion

Department chairs who may be candidates for tenure and/or promotion will be evaluated under the tenure and promotion procedures in Section 4-7. As listed in the introductory paragraph of Section 4-7.C, the Chair's Dean will carry out the duties normally the responsibility of the department chair. Necessarily, however, there will be no recommendation from the department chair regarding the tenure and/or promotion decision.

4-10.D Probationary Evaluations; Advisory Evaluations

Department chairs will receive a *contract renewal evaluation, based on rank and initial contract length*, just as any other probationary faculty member does (see Section 4-8). Procedures normally the responsibility of the department chair will be handled by the Chair's Dean. Necessarily, however, there will be no recommendation from the department chair regarding reappointment.

Any department chair, just as any other faculty member, can call for an advisory evaluation. Advisory evaluations may be requested by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Advisory evaluations have no formal consequences for decisions about contract renewal, tenure, or promotion.

4-10.E Evaluation for Renewable Terms for Department Chairs

Department chairs are appointed for terms of three years. They may be continued in the chair's position for one additional term. Procedures for appointment and for evaluation of chairs with respect to term continuation and renewal are specified in the Faculty Handbook, Section 10-6.C.

4-11 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)

4-11.A General Background

A. In response to the Board of Governors' and General Administration of The University of North Carolina's request to develop institutional policies and procedures with regard to post-tenure review, the Post-Tenure Advisory Committee of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke has prepared this document outlining UNC Pembroke's post-tenure review process. It is felt that this document adheres not only to the 1) broad principles outlined in the Executive Summary as found in the Report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review that was approved by the UNC Board of Governors on 16 May 1997, 2) the Guidelines as found in the

Administrative Memorandum Number 371 issued by President C. D. Spangler, Jr. on 24 June 1997, and 3) Chapter VI of The Code of the University (August, 1988), but also parallels and reflects the basic tenets of the Faculty Evaluation Model as found in the UNCP Faculty Handbook. It must furthermore be noted that nothing in this Post-Tenure document prohibits the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor from making personnel decisions and taking personnel actions relative to reappointment, non-reappointment, and dismissal of faculty in warranted cases as indicated by The Tenure Policies and Regulations of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke [UNCP Faculty Handbook, Section 5-1 through Section 5-9] and The UNC Code [The UNC Code, http://www.northcarolina.edu/content.php/policies/The_Code_TOC.htm].

B. In the words of the Executive Summary cited above, "Post-tenure review is 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. I)." This document further states that "institutional policies shall explicitly involve peers in the review process." In addition, it was noted in that report that the recommendations contained therein were intended "to strengthen the system of tenure and academic freedom while assuring on-going quality in the teaching, research, and service mission of The University of North Carolina."

C. Thus presented below are the necessary 1) principles and criteria upon which the UNCP post-tenure review process is based, 2) principles governing the roles of individuals and groups, 3) evaluation procedures to be followed, 4) forms needed for the cumulative evaluation of tenured faculty, 5) a calendar of events for cumulative evaluation of tenured faculty, and 6) a specified time line of not more than three academic years for the implementation of the review process.

4-11.B Principles and Criteria

A. Faculty at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke who are tenured must undergo the cumulative review process outlined below every five years. The purpose of this review is to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by (a) continuing tenure for faculty whose work is found satisfactory, (b) providing a clear plan and a specified time line of not more than three academic years for improvement of performance of faculty found unsatisfactory, and (c) for those whose performance remains unsatisfactory, providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which may include in the most serious cases of incompetence a recommendation for discharge. ["A faculty member, who is the beneficiary of institutional guarantees of tenure, shall enjoy protection against unjust and arbitrary application of disciplinary penalties. During the period of such guarantees the faculty member may be discharged or suspended from employment or diminished in rank only for reasons of incompetence, neglect of duty or misconduct of such nature as to indicate that the individual is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty." The UNC Code, Section 603(1).]

B. All UNCP faculty are evaluated annually in three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service) according to a four-category Standard Performance Rating Scale (Figure, Section 4-12.G). This annual review includes a(n) (a) Self-Evaluation Report, (b) Student Evaluation Report, (c) Chair's Evaluation Report, (d) Chair's Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation, (e) Dean's Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase, and (f) recommendation of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Section 4-6.B In addition to these reports, Evaluations for Contract Renewal and Evaluations for Tenure and/or Promotion include a Peer Evaluation Report. The latter of these evaluation processes also includes a Tenure and Promotion Evaluation Report (Section 4-4.C; and also Section 4-7 through 4-8.B). The comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review process outlined herein for tenured faculty in no way detracts from, replaces, or diminishes the importance and significance of this annual performance review.

Furthermore, a comprehensive review undertaken for promotion decision purposes may preclude the need for the cumulative review process outlined in this document until the fifth year following such review (see Section 4-11.C.1). As is true for all phases of the UNCP faculty evaluation model, a faculty member receives written feedback and has the right to submit a rebuttal to any aspect of reports submitted by Deans, department chairs or Peer Evaluation Committees.

C. Written feedback from the department chair and dean should include recognition for exemplary performance. 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. Any faculty response to a negative review will be forwarded with the packet to all subsequent levels of review.

D. In situations where a faculty member has received a rating of "unsatisfactory," an individual development or career plan will be created that includes (a) specific steps designed to lead to improvement, (b) a specified time line in which improvement is expected to occur, and (c) a clear statement of consequences should adequate improvement not occur within the designated time line. These consequences may include dismissal as allowed by The UNC Code, 603 (1). During the period allowed for improvement, the department chair or dean (in the case of a department chair) will meet with the faculty member on at least a semi-annual basis to review progress toward meeting the development plan's specifications. If the faculty member's duties are modified as a result of an unsatisfactory rating, the revised duties are specified in the development plan.

E. All phases of this evaluation process are to be guided by the principles set forth in Sections 4-1 to 4-3 of the UNCP Faculty Evaluation Model (UNCP Faculty Handbook). Thus all "Principles and Criteria" relevant to faculty evaluation detailed in Section 4-2 of that document are also relevant to the post-tenure evaluation process, and consequently are not repeated in this present document. These include principles and definitions, criteria, and documentation for the evaluation of teaching (Section 4-2.B), scholarship (Section 4-2.C), and service (Section 4-2.D).

4-11.C Principles Governing the Roles of Individuals and Groups

4-11.C.1 The Faculty Member Being Evaluated

All tenured faculty will undergo a cumulative review process every five years commencing from date of the tenure review. If during that period, the tenured faculty member is promoted, this cumulative review will not be necessary until the fifth year following the promotion review. When tenured faculty apply for promotion and undergo post-tenure review at the same time, separate decisions will be made on each. As indicated in Section 4-3.A of the UNCP Faculty Evaluation Model, the faculty member's self-evaluations should be "a primary source of information about the goals, methods, and degrees of success associated with his or her performance." As is also stated therein, the annual weights assigned to each area by the individual being evaluated are to be taken into account by subsequent evaluators. Furthermore, the candidate has the right to submit a rebuttal pertaining to any aspect of the reports submitted by the department chair or the Peer Evaluation Committee or Dean.

4-11.C.2 Students

As is the case with all evaluation procedures at UNCP, student evaluations, while thought to play a prominent role in evaluating the faculty member's teaching, do not by themselves provide sufficient information to judge fully a faculty member's performance as a teacher. Hence, evaluation of teaching effectiveness at UNCP involves a variety of types of documentation. [For

more information on the role that students play in the evaluation process at UNCP, see Section 4-3.B.]

4-11.C.3 The Peer Evaluation Committee

The Peer Evaluation Committee is selected by a process agreed upon by the tenured faculty within the department or unit. The final selection of committee members cannot be made by the faculty member who is being reviewed. The Peer Evaluation Committee is responsible for preparing and submitting a Peer Evaluation Report to the Office for Academic Affairs. This group is responsible for gathering appropriate information, assessing its implications, and formulating a coherent evaluation of the faculty member's performance. The Peer Evaluation process must be independent of the department chair's evaluation (or dean's in the case of a department chair). Following completion of the Peer Evaluation Committee's work, the department chair (or dean) must consult with the committee before sending the materials to the next level of review.

4-11.C.4 The Department Chair (or Dean for department chairs)

The department chair (Dean of the Chair's school or college for department chairs) is responsible for writing his/her own recommendations (see Figure, Form 4-12.H below). After consultation with the Peer Evaluation Committee, the chair (or dean) is responsible for submitting this document to the dean (or Office of Academic Affairs for department chair).

4-11.C.5 The Dean of the Faculty Member's School or College

The Dean will review the reports from the Chair and from the PEC, as well as any supporting materials and rebuttals. The Dean will assess the performance of the faculty member based on the materials presented and will complete the Dean's Recommendation for Post-Tenure Review. The Dean will give the faculty member a copy of the Dean's recommendation and submit that recommendation, with all attached materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

4-11.C.6 The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for taking appropriate actions, making recommendations based on the materials submitted by the Dean, ~~to the Chancellor~~ concerning the status of each tenured faculty member who has undergone the cumulative review process (for further information regarding the responsibilities of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, see Section 0 below). The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the faculty member, the faculty member's Department Chair (or Dean for department chairs), and the Dean of the relevant college or school, will also be responsible for constructing, monitoring, and evaluating satisfactory completion of any plan for improvement of performance for any faculty member whose performance has been judged unsatisfactory.

After reviewing the materials produced by this evaluation process, the Chancellor takes actions as deemed appropriate. In situations where a tenured faculty member has received a rating of "unsatisfactory," and the identified deficiencies are not removed in the specified period of time, the Chancellor may impose sanctions, which may include discharge as allowed by The UNC Code, Section 603 (1).

4-11.C.7 The Chancellor

~~As Chief Executive Officer of the University, the Chancellor receives, reviews, and acts upon the recommendations~~

~~of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. After reviewing the materials produced by this evaluation process, the Chancellor takes actions as deemed appropriate. In situations where a tenured faculty member has received a rating of "unsatisfactory," and the identified deficiencies are not removed in the specified period of time, the Chancellor may impose sanctions, which may include discharge as allowed by The UNC Code, Section 603 (1).~~

4.11.D Evaluation Procedures

A. The cumulative evaluation for tenured faculty provides a basis for the support and encouragement of excellence among tenured faculty by (a) continuing tenure for faculty whose work is found satisfactory, (b) providing a clear plan and a specified time line of not more than three academic years for improvement of performance of faculty found unsatisfactory, and (c) for those whose performance remains unsatisfactory, providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which can include a recommendation for discharge. All tenured faculty will undergo this cumulative review process every five years. If during that period, the tenured faculty member is evaluated for promotion, this cumulative review may not be necessary until the fifth year following the conclusion of that process (see Section 4-11.C.1). The cumulative review process includes the faculty member, the Peer Evaluation Committee, the department chair (Dean of relevant college or school in the case of department chairs), the Dean of the faculty member's college or school, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.~~, and the Chancellor.~~

B. At the point in time when the cumulative evaluation for tenured faculty process is to begin, the faculty member involved will be so notified in writing by his/her department chair (Dean of relevant college or school for department chairs) (see Calendar of Events below). The faculty member will subsequently submit to his or her department chair (Dean of relevant college or school for department chairs) a copy of (a) Self Evaluations for the previous five years, (b) Student Evaluation summaries for the previous five years, (c) Chair Evaluations for the previous five years, (d) Dean's annual evaluation reports for the previous five years, (e) any additional information since the last annual evaluation that is deemed pertinent, and (f) a completed copy of the Peer Evaluation Committee Request~~Nomination~~ Form (Figure, Section 4-12.B). In the initial stages of this process, these various materials might be collected from a variety of sources (the faculty member's own copies, copies in the possession of the department chair, and/or copies in the possession of the Office for Academic Affairs).

The department chair (or Dean for department chairs) then (a) appoints three faculty members to the Peer Evaluation Committee, (b) calls this group together for their initial meeting in order to orient them to the process, and (c) makes available to them the materials cited above with the exception of the Chair Evaluations. The Chair Evaluations are not made available to the Peer Evaluation Committee in order to protect the integrity and independence of the peer evaluation process.

C. ~~The make-up of the Peer Evaluation Committee will be identical to that described in Figure, Section 4-12.B of the UNCP Faculty Handbook.~~ The responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee will be consistent with those described in Section 4-7.D of the Faculty Handbook.

D. The Peer Evaluation Committee and the department chair (Dean of relevant college or school for department chairs), working independently of each other, are responsible for preparing

and submitting a Post-Tenure Evaluation Report Form (See Figure, Section 4-12.I) to the Dean of the faculty member's college or school and, through the Dean, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. These reports, based on the various documents that have been submitted, will include a rating of the overall performance of the faculty member as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory and a narrative justification. If the ranking indicates unsatisfactory performance, the Committee's report has the option of including specific suggestions that might lead to improvement. The faculty member undergoing this cumulative post-tenure review process will be given two completed, signed, and dated copies of each of these reports (the Peer Evaluation Committee's report and the department chair's report). Within three days, the faculty member being evaluated returns one copy that has been signed and dated. This signature indicates merely that the faculty member acknowledges being apprised of its contents, not that he/she agrees with it. In all cases, the faculty member being reviewed may submit a rebuttal to the Dean within ten days of having received these reports. These two reports are subsequently submitted by the respective chair (Peer Evaluation Committee or department) to the Dean of the faculty member's school or college.

E. The Dean of the relevant college or school will review the reports from the Department Chair (if available) and the Peer Evaluation Committee, including any supporting materials provided by the Chair or Peer Evaluation Committee, as well as any rebuttals submitted by the faculty member being evaluated. The Dean will then complete the Dean's Report for Post-Tenure Review, including his or her evaluation of the faculty member's performance as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The Dean's Report will serve as a cover letter to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and will include as attachments the reports from the Department Chair and from the Peer Evaluation Committee, along with all supporting documents. Within three days, the faculty member will sign the Dean's Report, acknowledging having seen it but not necessarily agreement with it. One copy of the signed Dean's Recommendation will be retained by the faculty member. The Dean will then forward his or her report, with the attached materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

If the Dean does not agree with the evaluation of the Chair and/or the PEC, the Dean must justify that judgment with appropriate comments. The faculty member has the right to submit a rebuttal to the Dean's evaluation within 10 days of signing the report.

F. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will review the Dean's report, with the reports of the Department Chair and the Peer Evaluation Committee and all supporting documents attached. In the event that the ratings in the reports submitted unanimously indicate unsatisfactory performance, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will communicate this finding in writing to the faculty member, the Department Chair (unless the faculty member is the department chair), and the Dean of the faculty member's college or school. It will be responsibility of the Department Chair (or Dean if the faculty member concerned is the Department Chair), in collaboration with the faculty member evaluated, to draw up an individual development or career (remediation) plan. The plan shall include steps designed to lead to improvement in the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level, a specified time frame of not more than three academic years in which this improvement is to occur, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement to a satisfactory level of performance not occur within the specified time frame. After review and concurrence by the Dean of the faculty member's college or school, the plan will be submitted to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who must approve the plan, taking into account the need for institutional resources to support the faculty member's efforts to remediate identified deficiencies in his or her performance.

At the end of the time period specified in the remediation plan, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the faculty member's Department Chair (Dean, if the faculty member is a department chair), and Dean of the faculty member's college or school, will determine if the provisions of the plan have been met. If so, the faculty member will be judged satisfactory in performance for the current post-tenure review cycle. Note that the existence of a remediation plan does not defer or postpone any succeeding post-tenure review. If the provisions of the remediation plan have not been met and the required improvement not occurred, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall recommend sanctions to the Chancellor, under the provisions of the UNCP Tenure Regulations (Section 5 of the Faculty Handbook) and of The Code of the University of North Carolina. Such sanctions may include reduction in rank, discharge, or other disciplinary action.

If performance ratings unanimously indicate satisfactory performance or if there is disagreement among the reports on the satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance of the faculty member being evaluated, the Provost and Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall ~~recommend to the Chancellor that no action be taken~~ accept the performance review report without further action. In the case where a faculty member's performance is found to be unsatisfactory, the Provost will take appropriate action(s). If any elements of unsatisfactory performance have not been improved to a satisfactory level in the specified period, the Provost's action may include discharge as specified by The UNC Code, Section 603 (1).

G. ~~As Chief Executive Officer of the University, the Chancellor receives, reviews, and acts upon all evaluative materials provided by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. After reviewing the materials produced by this evaluation process, the Chancellor will take appropriate action(s). In the case where a faculty member's performance is found to be unsatisfactory and those elements of unsatisfactory performance have not been improved to a satisfactory level in the specified period, the Chancellor's action may include discharge as specified by The UNC Code, Section 603 (1).~~

4-11.D Forms Required for Cumulative Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

4-11.D.1 Peer Evaluation Committee ~~Nomination Request Form.~~

See Figure, Section 4-12.B4-12.C.

4-11.D.2 Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Forms.

See Figures, Section 4-12.H 4-12.I and 4-12.M.

Post-tenure review

The policy was adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1998 and implemented during the 1998-99 academic year. It was revised by the Senate in 2001 for 2002-03 implementation.

- Introduction
 - Faculty to be reviewed
 - Timetable
 - Procedures
 - Criteria
 - Outcomes
 - Due process
 - Appeal from a finding of deficient or from a finding of non-compliance with a development plan
 - Failure to agree on a development plan
 - Policy review and revision
-

Introduction

Post-tenure review (PTR) is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality. The purpose of PTR is to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance; providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of faculty found deficient; and 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.

Just as an institution's policies governing the award of tenure must reflect the institution's mission, policies for PTR must also be guided by institutional mission, and the performance of each tenured faculty member must be evaluated in the context of the mission of the individual's college or school and department. While PTR is not a revalidation of the award of tenure, many characteristics of an institution's tenure policies remain relevant in judging the performance of tenured faculty. UNCW's Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Award of Tenure states:

The primary concern of the university is teaching its students. Thus teaching effectiveness is the primary criterion for reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

It follows that teaching effectiveness should be the primary evaluation area in the post-tenure review of a faculty member. The "Criteria" also states:

It is essential also that the university faculty be composed of individuals with a variety of strengths. Heterogeneity among faculty in contributions to the university is crucial.... Fixed weightings to be used in determining the relative importance of these different areas should be avoided in making reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions.

The most effective way to ensure that the importance of individual contributions is appropriately recognized, and to account for differences in the nature and mission of varied academic disciplines, is to base the post-tenure evaluation on peer review by departmental colleagues, and to have the department chair determine the quality of faculty performance and, when necessary, to guide the creation and implementation of a development plan. To effectively link the annual evaluation of faculty to PTR, the post-tenure review must take place at the departmental level, as do the annual evaluations.

PTR is an addition to an already elaborate process of faculty evaluation. Care must be taken to focus on the new features of evaluation that PTR brings, and to avoid redundancy of evaluation. The objective of PTR is to identify and reward exemplary faculty performance, and to identify and correct deficient faculty performance. PTR provides a new opportunity to identify sustained exemplary performance of faculty that may not be recognized over a period of only one year, and for which there has heretofore been no means of recognition. PTR provides a new constructive mechanism to correct deficient performance of faculty, in the rare event that it occurs. PTR should not be used to suggest ways that competent, conscientious faculty may merely improve their satisfactory performance—annual reviews already have that function.

[\[top of page\]](#)

Faculty to be reviewed

PTR is required of all tenured faculty whose primary responsibilities (50% or more) are teaching and/or research and/or service. Tenured librarians shall be subject to PTR. For each chair or administrator within a college or school^[1], the dean shall determine whether that person meets the criteria for mandatory review.

^[1] For the purposes of this policy, the term "college or school" shall include Randall Library, and the term "dean" shall include the University Librarian.

[\[top of page\]](#)

Timetable

Faculty of whom PTR is required must undergo a review no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent of these review events:

- award of tenure at UNCW
- departmental recommendation for promotion
- prior post-tenure review
- other equivalent comprehensive review of performance at UNCW
- return to faculty status following administrative service of two years or more

Exceptions shall be made in the following cases:

1. A period when a faculty member is on leave from professional duties shall not be included as part of the five years between mandatory review events; in such cases, the maximum interval shall be extended accordingly.
2. A period when a faculty member has reassigned time shall be included as part of the five years between mandatory review events; however, a faculty member who is temporarily assigned to duties away from the Wilmington area during the period when a review is required shall undergo review during the academic year when duties in the area are resumed.
3. PTR is not required of a faculty member who has officially set an irrevocable retirement or resignation within the next 12 months.

A tenured faculty member may elect to undergo PTR during any academic year. No faculty member shall be compelled to undergo PTR as described in this policy earlier than as required by this timetable.^[2] At the beginning of each academic year, each dean shall provide a list of those faculty required to be reviewed during that year.

^[2] This restriction applies to post-tenure review and does not limit other currently-existing forms of evaluation; for example, the Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure states, "When circumstances warrant, an evaluation may be initiated by the department chairperson, the appropriate dean, the provost and vice chancellor for Academic Affairs, or the chancellor."

[top of page]

Procedures

Performance shall be reviewed for the period since the prior review event or for the preceding five years, whichever period is less. A faculty member being reviewed shall provide a succinct report, for the period being evaluated, on professional activities in teaching, research/artistic achievement, and service. Each department shall establish the format for the report, except that it must include (where applicable) courses taught, theses directed, and all evaluations of teaching; publications, performances, and presentations; service activities; and all annual evaluations for the years under review.

PTR must include peer review of faculty professional performance. Each department shall establish a procedure for peer review, which must include an evaluation by at least three tenured colleagues of the faculty member's record in teaching, research/artistic achievement, and service. Faculty^[AM1] members do not select members of their review committee. Peer reviewers shall present their evaluations in writing as advice to the chair^[3], who will then write the evaluation relative to the mission of the university, college/school, and program. The chair's evaluation shall state whether the faculty member's overall professional performance has been *satisfactory*, *exemplary*, or *deficient*. The chair shall provide a copy of the evaluation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The faculty member has the option of attaching a written response. The chair shall forward a list of the peer evaluators, a copy of the evaluation, and the faculty member's response, if any, to the dean for information^[AM2]. The faculty member and chair shall sign the evaluation in acknowledgment of its receipt by the faculty

member. In the case of a finding of *deficient*, the faculty member has the right to appeal the finding on the basis of the four grounds stated to be impermissible (see Appeal from a finding of deficient or from a finding of non-compliance with a development plan below).

Each year the Provost shall establish deadlines for the completion of the PTR process.

[3] For the purposes of this policy, the term "chair" shall be equivalent to "immediate supervisor" and shall include the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs of the School of Nursing and the University Librarian.

[top of page]

Criteria

Criteria for *satisfactory* faculty performance are professional competence; conscientious discharge of duties, taking into account distribution of workload as assigned by the department chair; and efforts to improve performance. Criteria for *exemplary* faculty performance are sustained excellence in teaching, research/artistic achievement, and service; and professional performance that is substantially above expectations and that significantly exceeds the performance of most faculty. *Deficient* faculty performance is performance that does not meet the criteria for being judged satisfactory, as stated above. Annual evaluations for the period under review shall be given great consideration during PTR; faculty whose annual reviews have indicated satisfactory performance or better during that period shall normally be expected to receive a satisfactory evaluation or better under PTR.

[top of page]

Outcomes

In the case of performance judged to be *exemplary*, the results shall be documented for university award consideration. Documentation of such performance shall also be forwarded by the chair to the dean, the Provost, and the Chancellor for appropriate recognition.

In the case of performance judged to be *deficient*, the chair shall forward to the faculty member a copy of the evaluation by the deadline set by the Provost. The [AM3] negative review must include a statement of primary responsibilities and specific deficiencies. Within ten working days of receipt of the evaluation or within ten working days following the denial of an appeal of the finding of *deficient*, the chair and faculty member shall meet and, in consultation, begin to create a development plan. The plan shall include the following:

1. specific strategies [which] [AM4] include peer mentoring and steps designed to lead to improvement,
2. delineation of specific outcomes which constitute improvement,
3. resources to be committed, if any,

- 3-4. ~~modified~~ [AMS] duties should be considered in corrective plan
- 5. a specified timeline, not to exceed three years,
- 4-6. ~~A~~ [AM6]t least semi- annual meetings with chair on progress
- 5-7. a statement of the process by which performance under the plan will be evaluated and feedback provided to the faculty member, including a clear specification of who will conduct the evaluation, and
- 6-8. a clear statement of consequences should the improvement not occur.

The faculty member and the chair shall sign the development plan, and the chair shall forward a copy to the dean^[4], who must approve any resources to be committed.

A development plan shall not be required of a faculty member who has received a *satisfactory* review.

^[4] In the case of the Library, the plan shall be forwarded to the Provost or Provost's designee.

[top of page]

Due process

The Code states: "A faculty member who is the beneficiary of institutional guarantees of tenure shall enjoy protection against unjust and arbitrary application of disciplinary penalties. During the period of such guarantees, the faculty member may be discharged or suspended from employment or diminished in rank only for reasons of incompetence, neglect of duty, or misconduct of such a nature as to indicate that the individual is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty" (VI: 603). Due process and the right of appeal as specified in The Code and UNCW's Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure shall be guaranteed. The outcome of evaluation should be confidential—that is, confined to the appropriate university persons or bodies and the faculty member being evaluated—and released only at the discretion or with the consent of the faculty member.

A faculty member may appeal a finding of *deficient*, a finding of non-compliance with a development plan, or the imposition of sanctions other than discharge, suspension from employment, or diminishment in rank to the Faculty Professional Relations Committee (FPRC). A faculty member may appeal the imposition of serious sanctions (discharge, suspension from employment, or diminishment in rank) to the Hearings Panel as specified in Chapter VI of The Code.

[top of page]

Appeal from a finding of deficient or from a finding of non-compliance with a development plan

A faculty member may appeal a finding of deficient or a finding of non-compliance with a development plan, by letter to the chair of the Faculty Professional Relations Committee, within ten working days after the faculty member has received the written evaluation from the department chair.^[5] The FPRC reviews the request of the faculty member in order to determine whether the decision may have been based upon any of the grounds stated to be impermissible. A finding of *deficient* or a finding of non-compliance with a development plan may not be based upon (1) the faculty member's exercise of rights guaranteed by either the First Amendment to the United States Constitution or Article I of the North Carolina Constitution; (2) discrimination based upon the faculty member's personal characteristics, such as age, color, handicap, national origin, race, religion, sex, or sexual orientation; (3) personal malice; or (4) procedural irregularities that cast reasonable doubt upon the validity of the decision and which may include but are not limited to the following:

- a process not in compliance with the policies and procedures set forth in this document
- a process not in compliance with the policies and procedures set forth in the departmental PTR policy
- a process not in compliance with existing policies of faculty evaluation published in The Code or the UNCW Faculty Handbook
- a finding of *deficient* that is inconsistent with the faculty member's annual evaluations for the period under review, unless reasons for the finding are both extraordinary and also clearly and reasonably articulated in writing
- a finding of non-compliance with a development plan that is inconsistent with the terms stated in the development plan.

Should the committee determine that the evaluation may have been based upon any of these impermissible grounds, it grants the faculty member a hearing in accordance with Section [AM7] VII of UNCW's Policies on Academic Freedom and Tenure and with Section 607 of the Code. ~~and either sustains the appeal or else confirms the previous evaluation. The committee's decision is a recommendation to the Provost or the Provost's designee, whose decision is final.~~

^[5] In a department that has established in its post-tenure review policy an internal appeals process, the faculty member must first use that process before using university-level processes. The faculty member must initiate the university-level action within ten working days following a denial of the departmental appeal.

[top of page]

Failure to agree on a development plan

If a mutually acceptable plan is not reached within one month after the initial meeting, the currently existing mediation process of the Faculty Professional Relations Committee shall be utilized. If a mediated settlement cannot be achieved under the auspices of the FPRC, the FPRC shall advise adjustment by the dean^[6] as the committee considers appropriate and the dean^[6] shall act as arbitrator in the development of a plan.

[6] The Provost or the Provost's designee shall assume this role for the Library.

[\[top of page\]](#)

Policy review and revision

UNCW's PTR policy was initially developed by a committee of faculty, adopted by the Faculty Senate in the spring of 1998, and approved by the Board of Trustees of UNCW and by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina. The first academic year of its implementation was 1998-99.

Revisions in this PTR policy may be initiated at any time by action of the Faculty Senate. Non-editorial revisions require approval by both the Board of Trustees of UNCW and by the Board of Governors. Such revisions shall become effective in the academic year following their approval by the Board of Governors.

The policy was revised by the Senate in the fall of 2001 with implementation during the 2002-03 academic year.



WINSTON-SALEM STATE UNIVERSITY POST TENURE REVIEW POLICY

Post-Tenure Review

Faculty Members who hold Permanent Tenure must undergo a comprehensive evaluation no less frequently than every five years. A review undertaken to grant Permanent Tenure or decide on promotion qualifies as a cumulative review. Post-Tenure Review is designed to promote continuous renewal and improvement among Faculty Members who have Permanent Tenure. The review should be flexible enough to acknowledge different outcomes in different disciplines. Ultimately, the review is intended to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality. It shall be the responsibility of the Provost to assure compliance with standards of performance established by Faculty Members in their department.

Postponement of the scheduled five-year review may be requested for extenuating circumstances, such as illness, educational leave, and family and/or personal crisis. A request for postponement must be presented to and approved by the chair of the department, the dean, and the Provost.

Each department or school/college will elect a group of at least three Faculty Members who have Permanent Tenure, excluding the department chair, to serve on the Post-Tenure Review Committee. The faculty member being reviewed will not have the option of selecting members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee. If a department is unable to elect a group of at least three tenured Faculty Members, the dean in consultation with the department chair will coordinate the election of tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute the Post-Tenure Review Committee.

A chair shall be selected from the members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee. The chair and the Committee should be re-elected at two-year intervals.

The chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee will contact the Faculty Member(s) to be reviewed. The chair will provide the tenured Faculty Member(s) the timeline for the review. The Faculty Member will provide the committee with the following documents: written annual evaluations for the five years following the awarding of Permanent Tenure or last post-tenure review; a narrative articulating in executive summary format (3-5 pages) the outcomes achieved by the Faculty Member in the relevant performance of teaching, scholarship, and service areas relative to contributions to the mission of the institution, college/school, and academic program; and an updated curriculum vitae. If faculty responsibilities are primarily only to one or two of these areas, post-tenure review and resulting recommendations will take this allocation of responsibilities into account.

After careful consideration of the material evidence and consultation with the department chair, the Post-Tenure Review Committee shall render a report summarizing the results of the evaluation with recommendation(s). The report shall be reviewed by the chair and the dean, respectively, before it is presented to the Faculty Member by the chair of the Post Tenure Review Committee. A copy of the final report shall be sent to department chair, the dean, the Faculty Member and the Provost.

The evaluative findings are Outstanding Performance, Satisfactory Performance, or Unsatisfactory Performance. An Unsatisfactory Performance report 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. If the performance is unsatisfactory, the Faculty Member can contest the report and appeal the findings to the Faculty Grievance Committee; or the department chair and the Faculty Member will prepare a development plan to improve performance, not to exceed three years. If the Faculty Member's performance remains unsatisfactory after the three year period following the review, the department chair will recommend an appropriate disposition (sanction) to the dean. Disciplinary sanctions referencing failure to achieve the outcomes established in the overall Post-Tenure Review and the Development Plan must be consistent with criteria designated in the UNC Policy Manual.

Outstanding and Satisfactory Performance decisions will be transmitted to the Provost and shall follow the established university procedures for inclusion in the Faculty Member's permanent record. Faculty awards are available to faculty who exemplify excellence in teaching, research and service. Merit salary increases are also available to these faculty members.

If the findings of the Post-Tenure Review support an Unsatisfactory Performance rating and the Faculty Member does not wish to contest the results, a development plan will be devised by the Faculty Member and the department chair and/or the dean. The plan will 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 with the designated timeline. The department chair will provide a peer mentor and will schedule progress meetings with the Faculty Member who receives an Unsatisfactory Performance rating on at least a semi-annual basis during the specified timeline. If duties are modified as a result of a less than satisfactory rating, then the development plans shall be revised to take into account the new allocation of responsibilities. If the Faculty Member achieves the anticipated outcomes within the specified incremental time period, a Satisfactory or higher level rating (Outstanding) will be granted.

If the Faculty Member is progressing in a positive direction, but has not yet achieved the satisfactory or higher level performance rating, the chair and the Faculty Member shall redesign or adjust the development plan prior to reevaluation by the Post-Tenure Review Committee.

If the Faculty Member's performance remains unsatisfactory, the department chair will recommend an appropriate disposition (sanction) to the dean. Sanctions can range from discharge to reduction in rank. The Faculty Member may then enact the ~~grievance~~-procedure established by the university as outlined in the section on Due Process Before Discharge or Serious Sanctions if the department chair recommends discharge or some other sanction. Faculty rights under Code 600 will not be abrogated.

This 19th day of June 2009.

Nigel D. Alston
Chairman, Board of Trustees
Winston-Salem State University

Martin B. Davis
Secretary, Board of Trustees
Winston-Salem State University