

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

APPENDIX H

APPENDIX B-3

NORTH CAROLINA A & T STATE UNIVERSITY

POST TENURE REVIEW POLICY¹

PREPARED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROVISIONS IN

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA CODE, JULY, 1997

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES ON APRIL 15, 2004

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES ON SEPTEMBER 17, 2008

PASSED BY THE SENATE APRIL 28, 2009

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES ON SEPTEMBER 18, 2009

I. INTRODUCTION

The Post Tenure Review (PTR) process outlined herein is part of North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University's, as well as the University of North Carolina System's effort, to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality. This policy is implemented to comply with the 1997 mandate from the Board of Governors that all tenured faculty must be subject to performance review (Section 400.3.3 of the UNC Policy Manual) and the amended *Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty* as set forth by the Board of Governors in 2008 (Section 400.3.3.1 of the UNC Policy Manual). In accordance with these guidelines, the performance review process for tenured faculty at North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance. Faculty must undergo post tenure review no less often than every five years following the award of tenure. This policy is reviewed every five years.

PURPOSE

Post tenure review is intended to assure continuous improvement in the performance of the faculty as they carry out the institutional mission of teaching, research, creative work and service.² The objectives of the post tenure performance review are to: 1.) recognize and reward exemplary faculty performance, 2.) identify and plan to improve less than satisfactory faculty performance and 3.) provide for the administration of appropriate sanctions for faculty whose performance remains deficient. The performance review of tenured faculty is a peer-coordinated process which assesses level of performance, productivity, and/or career development over a longer term than is usually provided by an annual review.

¹ Approved by the Faculty Senate March 23 2004 with revisions approved by the Board of Trustees on September 17, 2008. Original policy dated July 1998.

² As the University moves forward with its Strategic Mission/Vision statement subsequent PTR policies may refer to teaching, research, creative work and service as "learning, discovery and engagement."

II. PTR EVALUATION PROCEDURES

PTR evaluations are based on performance standards developed and established by the faculty within the departments of each School/College, the School of Nursing and the Library. All references to 'department or department faculty' as used herein shall refer to all departments in the University, the School of Nursing, and the Library.

A. Standards for Performance

Tenured faculty within each department shall develop a narrative statement of the department's standards for performance by tenured faculty.³ Standards for Exemplary and Satisfactory shall be established for **each** of the areas: (1) Teaching Performance, (2) Research Performance, Professional Growth and Related Activities and (3) Service to the University and the broader community. When these standards are not met, the faculty member will be judged Deficient. **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.**

Department standards shall be consistent with the standards used for annual performance evaluations and the Faculty Handbook. **All department standards shall be fully consistent with the mission of the university, college/school, and department.** Department standards for post tenure review shall in no way abrogate the due process protections in Chapter VI of *the Code* or abridge the rights of the faculty member as described in the *Regulations on Academic Freedom, Tenure and Due Process* (Appendix B-2 of the Faculty Handbook). The University shall provide reasonable resources needed by the faculty to achieve the required level and quality of performance.

The statement of standards, approved by the departmental tenured faculty, shall be the basis for evaluating a tenured faculty member's performance. The Dean shall forward the statement of standards for each department to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs along with verification that the standards have been written and approved by the tenured departmental faculty. At the beginning of each fall semester the standards shall be distributed to all tenured and tenure-track faculty. Departments shall review their standards at least once every five years. A revised policy must follow the process for approval as set forth for the initial policy. Faculty shall undergo post tenure review under the standards that were in place in the first year of their five-year cycle of post tenure review, except for standards imposed by the Board of Governors.

B. Schedule of Evaluation

In accordance with UNC policy, faculty shall undergo Post Tenure Review (PTR) no less frequently than every five years following the awarding of permanent tenure. A successful review for promotion, after a faculty member receives tenure, satisfies the requirements for the faculty member's post tenure review. If the faculty member has an unsuccessful review for promotion, that faculty member shall undergo a PTR during the next academic year.

³ Department Chairpersons are considered administrators. As such they are not subject to PTR evaluation but rather to an administrator's evaluation. The writing of the department performance standards is a faculty task and as such the Department Chairpersons may not participate.

Similarly, a faculty member who establishes a Performance Development Plan following a PTR evaluation shall undergo his/her next PTR evaluation five years after completing his/her Performance Development Plan.⁴ The five-year counting process shall be put on hold **during the period of time 1) while a faculty member is on an official leave of absence, or 2) while a faculty member serves in administration.** The post tenure review clock will resume when the leave or administrative appointment **ends**. When necessary, a faculty member may make a written request to the Dean with a copy to the Chairperson for a delay of up to one year.

Review of a faculty member with a joint appointment shall be conducted in the primary department where the faculty member's tenure was granted with input from other departments in which the faculty member holds joint appointment.

Faculty who have submitted to their Department Chairperson and Dean a certified letter of irrevocable intent to retire and/or resign, effective within **one** year of their scheduled PTR, may elect not to undergo a PTR.⁵

III. PTR EVALUATION TIMELINE and PROCEDURES

The calendar for PTR evaluation procedures shall be:

DATES	EVALUATION PROCEDURES
First Department meeting in the Fall	Department Chairperson shall distribute department Post Tenure Review standards to all tenured or tenure-track faculty.
Last Friday in August	The Provost shall notify the Dean of faculty members who are scheduled for Post Tenure Review in accordance with the five year cycle.
By September 15th	The Dean shall notify the Department Chairperson of faculty in the department who are scheduled for review.
Last Friday in September	- The Department Chairperson shall notify the faculty member in writing that a performance review will be conducted. The notification letter should include the Website addresses of the University's PTR policy and a copy of the PTR Submission Form. (See Sample - <u>FORM A: The Submission Form</u> p. 114.) - The Department Chairperson will call a meeting of the tenured faculty who will select three tenured faculty to serve on the Performance Review Committee (PRC). The tenured faculty members selected for the PRC will select a PRC chairperson in that meeting. A faculty member

⁴ Both a review for promotion and the successful completion of a Performance Development Plan are cumulative reviews and satisfy the Guideline in the General Administration Memorandum 371, dated June 24, 1997, that faculty undergo "a cumulative review no less frequently than every five years."

⁵ Faculty members who have entered into a Phased Retirement Program with the University, as part of their agreement have relinquished tenure and consequently are not subject to PTR.

APPENDIX H

	being reviewed may vote on the PRC membership, but may not, on his or her own, unilaterally select one or more members of the PRC.
Last Friday in October (or 30 days after receiving the request for the portfolio)	The faculty member being reviewed shall submit his/her portfolio, in accordance with the department standards, to the Department Chairperson.
First Friday in November	The Department Chairperson or academic unit head will forward the portfolio to the PRC and charge the PRC to begin the review.
January 15th	The PRC submits its report to the Department Chairperson or academic unit head and the faculty member being reviewed.
Within 7 days after receiving the PRC report	The faculty member being reviewed may respond in writing to the PRC Report with copies to the PRC and the Department Chairperson.
February 1st	• The Department Chairperson shall write a letter to the faculty member, with copies to the PRC members indicating his/her response to the PRC findings. • The Chairperson will forward a copy of the PRC's report to the Dean along with the Chair's response, a copy of the departmental standards, and any response from the faculty member. The faculty member's portfolio will be forwarded to the Dean if applicable.
March 1st	The Dean shall write a letter to the faculty member, with copies to the PRC members and the Department Chairperson, indicating his/her response to the PRC's findings.
Within 7 days after receiving the Dean's response	The faculty member being reviewed may respond to the PRC Report, the Chairperson's response, and the Dean's letter in writing to the Dean.
April 1st	The Dean will notify the faculty member by letter of the Post Tenure Review decision and shall send a copy of his/her letter, along with a copy of the PRC report, the department standards and any correspondence from the reviewee, the Department Chairperson, and members of the PRC to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
By May 1st	The Provost will respond to the Dean and faculty member in writing regarding the Post Tenure Review decision.

A. Selection of Performance Review Committee

Tenured faculty in all departments in all Schools/Colleges shall constitute the pool eligible to serve as members of a Performance Review Committee (PRC). Administrative tenured faculty are ineligible to serve on a PRC. The Office of the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall verify annually the eligibility of all committee members and maintain records of the members of the University-wide PRCs. From this pool, three faculty members shall be selected to serve on the PRC in accordance with the selection process and term of service agreed upon by the tenured faculty in the department, School of Nursing, or the Library. The selection process shall provide for the replacement of a PRC member in the event of illness or separation from the University. Committee members will select a chairperson of the PRC. **A faculty member being reviewed may not unilaterally select members of the peer review committee.**

C. The Review Portfolio

The faculty member selected for review shall submit a review portfolio to his/her Department Chairperson by the last Friday in October or 30 days after receiving the letter of notification from his/her Department Chairperson, whichever is the later date. Failure to submit a portfolio on a timely basis may result in disciplinary actions.⁶

The post tenure review portfolio shall include both qualitative and quantitative documentation of performance over the review period. The PTR Submission Form (p.114) is provided as a sample.

The faculty member has the right and obligation to provide all the documents, materials, and statements relevant and necessary for review in accordance with Department standards, and all materials submitted shall be included in the portfolio. The documentation shall include evidence of teaching, research, creative work, professional growth, and service to the University and the broader community. At minimum, the portfolio must include the last four annual reviews and the current curriculum vita. Other materials, at the discretion of the faculty member, may include a maximum of six letters of support from NCA&TSU colleagues and persons external to the university. The portfolio shall be submitted in one three-ring notebook binder with a table of contents, and tabbed sections for ease in locating sections and materials. The faculty member has final determination regarding the contents of the review portfolio and no documents may be added to the portfolio without the faculty member's approval.

⁶ Included in such actions is the possibility of dismissal, suspension of employment, reduction in rank or reduction in rank with commensurate reduction in salary. If the faculty member fails to submit the portfolio, the Dean shall so advise the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Penalties may be imposed only in accordance with the procedures prescribed in Appendix B-2, Section 4 - **Faculty Handbook** and with Chapter VI of **The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina**. (See the **APPEAL** section.)

IV. THE REVIEW PROCESS

The performance review focuses on the faculty member's (1) Teaching Performance, (2) Research Performance, Professional Growth and Related Activities and (3) Service to the University and broader community, based on the department standards.

A. Evaluation of the Portfolio

Upon receiving a portfolio, the Department Chairperson shall forward it to the chairperson of the PRC who will convene the PRC.

The PRC shall render a judgment of Exemplary, Satisfactory or Deficient in **each** of the three faculty areas of responsibility and an overall judgment of Exemplary, Satisfactory or Deficient. Considerable justification must be given if findings of the Post Tenure Review differ substantially from the findings of the four most recent annual reviews. Additionally, the review is to provide informed and candid feedback to the faculty member concerning the quality of his/her contributions, as well as any weaknesses or deficiencies in performance, along with constructive recommendations. If the faculty member has received an overall judgment of Deficient, recommendations for the Professional Development Plan (PDP) must be included in the report. The PRC, after reaching its decisions, shall collectively draft its findings. The chairperson of the PRC shall write a finished version of the committee's report and circulate it to committee members for agreement and/or suggested changes. The finalized report shall be signed by each of the three committee members. By January 15th, the chairperson of the PRC shall, on the same day, give the report to the faculty member and a copy to the Department Chairperson.

In keeping with UNC policy (400.3.3.1), post tenure review outcomes in an academic unit must be reviewed at one or more higher administrative levels and the department chair or academic unit head must consult with the PRC.

B. PTR Overall Assessments

The performance review shall result in one of three possible overall assessments: Exemplary, Satisfactory, or Deficient. An overall assessment of Exemplary or Satisfactory concludes the faculty member's PTR for the current five-year cycle. An overall assessment of Deficient shall result in the faculty member having to address the deficiencies. The overall assessments are outlined as follows:

1. Exemplary - An overall judgment of Exemplary requires that the faculty member is judged Exemplary in Teaching Performance and in Research Performance, Professional Growth and Related Activities and is Exemplary or Satisfactory in Service to the University. An overall judgment of Exemplary may also be awarded when the faculty member is judged Exemplary in Teaching and Exemplary in Service to the University when extraordinary and long-term service has been rendered in a particular area of the University mission. An overall assessment of Exemplary concludes the PTR process for the five-year cycle.

All faculty members whose performance is judged Exemplary must receive:

- a letter of commendation from the Provost's Office
- recognition in the local newspaper, Aggie Report, and campus newspaper
- recognition at the Honor's Day Convocation (names submitted by the Provost's Office) with a University lapel pin and a plaque.


Additionally,

- the faculty member may be considered for campus amenities such as a one year membership at the fitness center, passes for the faculty or student dining hall and season football/basketball passes.
- the faculty member may be considered for a professional development grant, i.e., a monetary award, which may be used for such things as travel to professional meetings, professional association memberships, computer hardware/software, office supplies, etc.;
- the faculty member may be recommended for priority consideration for a one-semester three-hour teaching load reassignment with the agreement of the faculty member and approval of as approved by the Department Chairperson and Dean;
- the faculty member may be recommended by the Department Chairperson for consideration by the School/College Awards Committee/University Awards Committee, including the UNC Board of Governor's Excellence in Teaching Award Committee.

2. Satisfactory - An overall judgment of Satisfactory requires that the faculty member is judged at least Satisfactory in Teaching Performance and in Research Performance, Professional Growth and Related Activities, and in Service to the University. **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.** A faculty member who is judged to be Satisfactory will receive a letter from the Provost with copies to the Dean and Chairperson. An overall assessment of Satisfactory concludes the PTR process for the five year cycle.

3. Deficient- A faculty member who is not judged Exemplary or Satisfactory is considered Deficient and shall develop a Professional Development Plan (PDP). **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.** The recommendations for the PDP shall be included in the report. The PRC will provide a copy of the report to the faculty member and the Department Chairperson.

OVERVIEW OF PTR OUTCOMES



C. The Faculty Member's Response to the PRC Report

The faculty member must be given an opportunity to provide a written response to the report of the Performance Review Committee, the Chairperson's letter, and the Dean's response and each must be included in the PTR report that is submitted to the next highest administrative level. The faculty member will have seven days to respond to each.

D. Department Chairperson and Dean Responses to a PRC Report

In keeping with UNC policy (400.3.3.1), post tenure review outcomes in an academic unit must be reviewed at one or more higher administrative levels. The Department Chairperson shall write a letter to the faculty member, with copies to the PRC members, indicating his/her response to the PRC's findings. The Chairperson will forward a copy of his/her response and the PRC's report to the Dean along with, a copy of the departmental standards, and any response from the faculty member. When the faculty member is judged Deficient, the Chairperson will forward the faculty member's portfolio.

The Dean shall write a letter to the faculty member, with copies to the PRC members and the Department Chairperson, indicating his/her response to the PRC's findings. The Dean shall send a copy of this letter, along with a copy of the PRC report and any correspondence from the reviewee, the Department Chairperson and members of the PRC to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

When the Department Chairperson or the Dean disagrees with the PRC report, he/she must consult with the PRC. The consultation with the PRC shall be done with all three PRC members present and the department standards must frame the discussion. The Chairperson or the Dean may ask the PRC to reconsider its findings when the Chairperson or the Dean believes the PRC has misapplied a department standard or provides evidence that the faculty member's portfolio, upon which the PRC based its report, contains inaccurate information. For example, the PRC has judged the faculty member Satisfactory on Research Performance, Professional Growth and Related Activities when the standard calls for at least one publication in a refereed journal and the faculty member has none. The resolution of each specific issue will be based on a consensus or a simple majority with each PRC member, the Chairperson, and the Dean having one vote. A tie will be construed as a favorable decision for the faculty member. The PRC shall determine whether to alter the PRC report as a result of the consultation.

V. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

When the faculty member is judged Exemplary or Satisfactory overall, the PTR process for the current five-year cycle ends. When the faculty member is judged Deficient, the faculty member must address each deficiency and establish a Performance Development Plan (PDP) in consultation with the Department Chairperson and in accordance with the recommendations of the PRC. **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.** The PDP should be formulated within 30 days of the faculty member's receiving the PRC report and shall be designed for completion within a three-year period.

Developing the Performance Development Plan

The Department standard for Satisfactory in Teaching, Research, and Service shall form the basis of the PDP criteria. Although each PDP is tailored to individual circumstances, the PDP will:

- identify specific strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's performance
- define specific measurable and objective goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies
- outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes
- set appropriate time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes
- indicate appropriate criteria by which the faculty member could monitor progress
- identify institutional resources to support the PDP
- a clear statement of consequences should improvements not occur within the designated time.

When the Department Chairperson and the faculty member have developed a PDP, the Department Chairperson shall submit the PDP to the Dean with a copy to the PRC. When the Dean accepts the PDP, the faculty member, the Department Chairperson and the PRC are so informed in writing by the Dean, who also forwards a copy to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Failure of the faculty member and the Department Chairperson to reach an agreement on a PDP shall necessitate mediation by the Dean with input from the PRC. This meeting shall include the Dean, Department Chairperson, the faculty member, and the three members of the PRC. The decision to accept or reject the PDP shall be based on a simple majority. The faculty member does not vote. When the PDP is accepted, the faculty member must comply with the PDP. When the PDP is rejected, the Department Chairperson and the faculty member must revise the PDP and submit it to the Dean with a copy to the PRC.

VI. ASSESSMENT

A PDP requires periodic assessment. This assessment must include accomplishments relative to: 1.) the measurable and objective goals and outcomes 2.) activities to be undertaken 3.) timelines for accomplishment of activities and achievement of outcomes 4.) criteria by which the faculty member can monitor progress; and 5.) institutional resources that will support the PDP including mentoring peers.

Assessment of Progress and Completion of a PDP

The faculty member and the Department Chairperson shall meet semiannually to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying the identified deficiencies. The second meeting of the year shall determine whether the annual progress on the PDP is acceptable and shall include the Department Chairperson, the faculty member, and the three members of the PRC. The decision to accept or reject the annual progress on the PDP shall be based on a simple majority with the Department Chairperson and the PRC members each having one vote. A tie will be construed as acceptable progress. The faculty member shall not vote. The Department Chairperson will forward the PDP progress report signed by the PRC members and the Chairperson to the Dean at the end of the academic year.

If the Dean does not agree with the annual assessment of the PRC and the Department Chairperson, the Dean shall notify the PRC, the Chairperson and the faculty member in writing within 14 days and shall initiate a consultation with the Department Chairperson, faculty member and the three members of the PRC. The decision to accept or reject the annual progress on the PDP shall be based on a simple majority with the Dean, Department Chairperson, and the PRC members each having one vote. A tie will be construed as acceptable progress. The faculty member shall not vote. The Department Chairperson, the PRC, and/or the faculty member may respond in writing to the Dean within 14 days of the Dean's letter or the consultation.

In the last year, the faculty member, the Department Chairperson, and the PRC shall meet by the last Friday in February. The final meeting and report may come earlier if the faculty member is ahead of schedule in completing his/her PDP. When the Department Chairperson and the PRC conclude that the objectives of the PDP have been met, the Department Chairperson shall make a final report to the Dean and send a copy to the faculty member and PRC. When the Dean accepts the report, the faculty member and the Department Chairperson are so informed, by the first Friday in March, and a copy is forwarded to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This ends the PDP assessment process. The PDP is a cumulative review and the faculty member's next PTR evaluation shall come five years after this cumulative review.

When the Dean disagrees that the objectives of the PDP have been met, the Dean shall initiate a consultation with the Department Chairperson, the faculty member, and the three members of the PRC. The decision to accept or reject the completion of the PDP shall be based on a simple majority with the Dean, Department Chairperson, and the three PRC members each having one vote. A tie will be construed as acceptable completion. The faculty member shall not vote. When the conclusion of the meeting is that the objectives of the PDP have been met, the Dean shall write a letter to the faculty member with copies to the Department Chairperson, the PRC and the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This ends the PDP assessment process. The PDP is a cumulative review and the faculty member's next PTR evaluation shall come five years after this cumulative review.

When the outcome of the vote is that the faculty member has not satisfied the objectives of his/her PDP, the Dean's letter to the Provost/Vice Chancellor and the faculty member shall recommend an appropriate sanction. **Any action 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.** The Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall, by the third Friday in May, write a letter to the Dean supporting his/her recommended sanction or replacing it with an alternative sanction. The Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall send a copy of his/her letter to the faculty member, the Department Chairperson, the chairperson of the PRC, and the Dean. The faculty member may appeal the sanction. (See the **APPEAL** section.)

VII. APPEAL

If the faculty member believes the post tenure review process and resulting sanctions have been unjustly or arbitrarily applied, within five days after receiving a written notice of the penalty, he/she may request, in writing, a private conference with the Dean. This request shall be granted, and the conference held forthwith, within five days after receipt of the request, if possible.

Within five days after the conference, the Dean shall give the faculty member an unelaborated, written statement of whether the original decision remains in effect. Within five days after receiving notice that the original decision remains in effect, the faculty member may in writing request a conference with the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This request shall be granted, and the conference held forthwith, within five days after receipt of the request, if possible.

Within ten days of this conference, the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall send a written evaluation of the matter to the faculty member, the Dean and the Department Chairperson. The evaluation may be in the form of an unelaborated concurrence with the decision; an expression of disagreement with the decision, with or without supporting reasons; or a recommendation for reconsidering the decision, with or without suggestions for specific procedures in doing so.

Within five days of receiving an evaluation from the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs that disagrees with the decision or recommends its reconsideration, the Dean shall give the faculty member and the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs a response in writing.

For a grievance pertaining to this process prior to a discharge or imposition of other sanction, the full faculty grievance process becomes operative as prescribed in the Policy Manual of the University of North Carolina (*Grievances filed pursuant to Section 607 of The Code*) and in the *Regulations on Academic Freedom, Tenure and Due Process* (Appendix B-2 of the Faculty Handbook). A discharge or imposition of other sanction may be appealed pursuant to Section 603 of The Code and in the *Regulations on Academic Freedom, Tenure and Due Process* (Appendix B-2 of the Faculty Handbook)

FORM A: SUBMISSION FORM

**North Carolina A&T State University
Submission for Faculty Post Tenure Review⁷**

1. Teaching Performance

- a. Summarize evidence of effectiveness in teaching in the last five years. This may include:
 - Brief discussion of teaching methods used in classroom
 - Summary of student evaluation results with discussion of additional efforts to collect student evaluations
 - Attendance at workshops, seminars and conferences in specialty area
 - Relationships maintained with other professionals in specialty area
- b. Summarize special contributions to course and curriculum development, experimentation with new methods, materials, etc. in the last five years. This may include:
 - Description of courses developed and taught
 - Use of appropriate technologies in the classroom
 - Use of other materials (e.g., journal articles, study guides, etc.)
 - Innovative approaches to teaching
 - Other devices used to enhance the learning experience (e.g., field trip)
- c. Summarize evidence of effectiveness in academic advising and counseling.

2. Research Performance, Professional Growth and Related Activities.

- a. List in bibliographic form publications in the last five years OR describe creative works/performances in the last five years
- b. Summarize evidence from last five years of funded research
- c. Summarize evidence of professional growth with the past five years. This may include:
 - Professional meetings/conferences/workshops/seminars attended
 - Professional memberships/registrations maintained

3. Service to the University

- a. List significant committee and administrative responsibilities and contributions. Provide evidence of level of participation/contribution.
 - Department
 - School/College
 - University
- b. Indicate significant contributions to the broader community outside the University.
 - Consulting/professional activities outside of the University
 - Other contacts with and/or participation in professional organizations
 - Workshops/seminars conducted

⁷ 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.

APPENDIX H

Tenured Faculty Performance Review Policy

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Purpose

The purpose of Tenured Faculty Performance Review is to provide for the periodic and comprehensive review of the performance of all faculty members who have tenure and whose primary duties are teaching, research, and service. The goals of such a review are to promote faculty development and productivity and provide additional accountability.

Applicability of Review Process

The Tenured Faculty Performance Review process is applicable to all tenured members of the faculty who have been on a continuous contract for a period of five years or more since their last cumulative review. Tenured faculty members ordinarily must undergo a Tenured Faculty Performance Review once every five years; a faculty member shall not be subject to a mandatory Tenured Faculty Performance Review more than once every five years. Department Chairs, Deans, and other administrators whose primary responsibilities are not teaching and research are exempt from a Tenured Faculty Performance Review while they are serving in their administrative posts. Upon returning to full-time faculty duties, they are subject to a Tenured Faculty Performance Review. A faculty member may request postponement of a scheduled Tenured Faculty Performance Review for extenuating personal circumstances, such as health problems. The request for a postponement must be in writing and submitted for approval by the faculty member's Chair and Dean.

Relationship Between Tenured Faculty Performance Review and Review for Promotion

Tenured Faculty Performance Review will be coordinated with the review of a faculty member for promotion in the following ways:

A departmental consideration for promotion five years after a faculty member receives tenure satisfies the requirements for the faculty member's Tenured Faculty Performance Review. One outcome of the promotion review could be a requirement that the faculty member prepare a developmental plan as described below.

If a faculty member ***postpones the application*** for promotion five years after receiving tenure, he or she will undergo a Tenured Faculty Performance Review. The Tenured Faculty Performance Review, in this case, would satisfy the requirement of a promotion review five years after the award of tenure.

Relationship between Annual Reviews and Tenured Faculty Performance Review

The performance of each faculty member must be reviewed annually by his/her Department Chair. That review must be in writing and provided to the faculty member. Annual performance reviews, however, are not a substitute for the comprehensive, periodic, and cumulative Tenured Faculty Performance Review required by the UNC

Board of Governors and described in this Policy. The Tenured Faculty Performance Review can be informed by annual reviews but must involve additional assessment as described in this Policy.

Procedures

Initiating the Review Process

Whenever a Tenured Faculty Performance Review is initiated, the Chair shall first consult with the faculty member and then shall establish a schedule for the conduct of the review by the Review Committee (see definition below). Ordinarily, a faculty member should be given at least four months' notice that one is to be reviewed.

Review File

To initiate the review process, the Department Chair, in cooperation with the faculty member, shall construct a Tenured Faculty Performance Review file containing **only**: (a) copies of the faculty member's last five annual review letters from the Department Chair; (b) a current curriculum vitae; and (c) an optional statement describing his or her professional accomplishments in teaching, research and service. The faculty member should indicate if his or her responsibilities are limited primarily to only one or two of these areas so that post-tenure review and resulting reviews and recommendations will take these allocations into account. If necessary for clarification, the Chair or Review Committee may request further information.

The Review Committee

The Department Review Committee or a special committee selected by the tenured members of the department shall conduct the review of the faculty member's performance. The Committee shall be selected according to the department, college and University procedures. The faculty member being reviewed does not have the option of selecting members of the Review Committee. The Review Committee shall review the file and may meet with the Chair and the faculty member, either together or separately. The Committee may consult other sources of information not included in the file, if deemed appropriate, with the approval of the Chair. In accordance with the schedule for the review established by the Chair, the Review Committee shall make a written assessment of the faculty member's performance, including, where appropriate, recommendations to the Chair intended to enhance the faculty member's contributions to the unit and the University. The Review Committee Report is advisory to the Chair. The Report shall include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's performance and should also include recognition for exemplary performance. This written assessment shall conclude with one of the following findings:

"Satisfactory" The faculty member has no substantial and chronic performance deficiencies.

"Seriously Deficient" The faculty member has substantial and chronic performance deficiencies. The Review Committee shall state and describe the performance deficiencies in its Report. The Committee shall forward its findings to the Chairperson.

The standards for determining **"seriously deficient"** performance shall be determined by the faculty in each unit, and, when approved by the appropriate Chair and Dean, and by the Provost, shall become part of its Tenured Faculty Performance Review procedures. A determination of "seriously deficient" performance 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.

The Chair shall provide the faculty member being reviewed a copy of both the Review Committee report and the Chair's recommendation. The faculty member will be provided an opportunity to respond in writing. The faculty member's response shall be shared at the next highest administrative level. The report and any response from the faculty member shall be made a part of the faculty member's permanent personnel record.

Review by Chair and Dean

Review by the Chair

The Review Committee submits its written evaluation to the Chair. The Chair may accept or reject the recommendation of the Review Committee. The Chair may reject the Review Committee's recommendation only with compelling evidence, communicated in writing to the faculty member, the Dean and the department Review Committee. The Chair's written appraisal shall include a statement on the extent to which the Chair accepts or rejects the findings and recommendations of the Review Committee report and includes the reasons and evidence for such a conclusion. A recommendation for sanctions to be imposed on the faculty member related to his or her lack of performance under the terms and expectations of a previously agreed upon performance improvement plan will be described in the Chair's written statement.

Review by the Dean

The Chair submits a written appraisal to the Dean. The Dean may accept or reject the Chair's recommendation. The Dean may reject the Chair's recommendation only with compelling evidence. In the event that the Dean's appraisal of the Tenured Faculty Performance Review outcome differs from that provided by the Department Review Committee or the Chair, the Dean will submit the faculty member's review materials to the College Review Committee for an advisory review, and the Dean's objections, reasons and evidence will be communicated in writing. The Dean's response shall be provided to the faculty member, the Chair, and the Provost.

Faculty Appeals

A faculty member dissatisfied with the results of the Tenured Faculty Performance Review and the Chair's subsequent appraisal, or the Dean's acceptance, modification or rejection of it, may pursue any appeal or remedy otherwise available to faculty members relating to matters that affect their employment status. If discharge or other serious sanctions are imposed as a result of a seriously deficient post-tenure performance review, University regulations are the appeal procedures outlined in Section 8 of the Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of The University of North Carolina at Charlotte will apply contained in the ~~Tenure Policies, Procedures, and Regulations~~ of The University of North Carolina at Charlotte. For lesser actions, a faculty member may pursue an appeal through the UNC Charlotte "Procedures for Resolving Faculty Grievances Arising from Section 607(3) of The Code of The University of North Carolina." [JESH1]

Developmental Plan

When the Chair and the Dean agree that the faculty member's performance is seriously deficient, the Chair will require that the faculty member have a written developmental plan designed to improve the faculty member's performance in clearly identified areas over a specified time period. The developmental plan will be prepared jointly by the Chair and faculty member and will include at a minimum: (a) the expectations of the Chair as to how the faculty member can remedy the deficiency or deficiencies in performance or enhance the faculty member's professional accomplishments and contributions to the unit; (b) specific performance goals and objectives, timetables for achieving such goals over a two-to-three year period, and the criteria to be used in measuring progress toward the performance goals; (c) the resources or developmental support, if any, the Chair is willing and able to provide the faculty member to assist in implementing the plan; (d) any adjustment in workload, assignments or responsibilities of the faculty member in order to enhance his or her performance and contribution to the mission of the unit; and (e) consequences that might follow if deficiencies are not corrected. If the faculty member's duties are modified as a result of a determination of "seriously deficient" performance, then the developmental plan should reflect that modification and take into account the new allocation of responsibilities. The use of mentoring peers in all developmental plans is encouraged.

The developmental plan will be reviewed by the Dean, who may make suggestions for improving the plan. When the plan has received the final approval of the faculty member, the Chair, and the Dean, it will be implemented by the faculty member.

Monitoring and Re-evaluation of Performance

Progress towards achieving the goals and timetables set out in the development plan will be reviewed at least semi-annually by the Chair, who will provide detailed feedback to the faculty member and a copy to

the Dean. At the end of the time period specified in the developmental plan, the Chair, in consultation with the Department Review Committee, will review the faculty member's performance and make one of the following recommendations:

- The faculty member has improved his or her performance, and no further action is necessary pending the next regularly scheduled Tenured Faculty Performance Review;
- The faculty member's performance has improved but not at the expected level. The Chair may require an adjustment in the developmental plan or in the faculty member's workload in order to improve further the faculty member's performance; or
- The faculty member's performance remains seriously deficient. The Chairperson may recommend the imposition of appropriate sanctions. Any decision to recommend imposition of serious sanctions should occur only after the widest consultation with the tenured faculty in the department; whether this involves a poll or other mechanism is left up to the department. However, the department is expected to transmit the outcome of such consultation with the senior faculty to the Dean.

In all cases, the Chair's recommendation is forwarded to the faculty member and the Dean.

Dean's Review and the Possible Imposition of Sanctions

The Dean reviews the recommended action:

If the Dean agrees with a departmental recommendation that no further action is necessary, the review process stops pending the next regularly scheduled Tenured Faculty Performance Review.

If the Dean agrees with a recommendation for a workload adjustment, the adjustment is implemented and the review stops pending the next regularly scheduled Tenured Faculty Performance Review.

If the Dean agrees with a departmental recommendation for the imposition of serious sanctions, the Dean forwards this recommendation to the Provost. Serious sanctions may be imposed only in accord with Section 8 of the Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of The University of North Carolina at Charlotte (pp.17-19). Serious sanctions that may be imposed include demotion, salary reduction and, in the most serious cases, may include a recommendation for discharge. A faculty member retains full rights to seek a hearing if the decision is made to impose serious sanctions. Neither a negative review nor an insufficient improvement from a development plan will necessarily result in the imposition of sanctions; such sanctions may be imposed only upon grounds specified in Section 8 of the Tenure Policies. In the imposition of serious sanctions, the burden of proof is on the University to prove that

APPENDIX H

the serious deficiencies on the developmental plan constitute incompetence or neglect of duty.

If the Dean disagrees with the departmental decision, the departmental and Dean's recommendation are forwarded to the Provost for review.

4.08 Post-Tenure Review

A. Introduction

Post-tenure review (PTR) is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of all tenured faculty. The purpose of this review is to support continuing faculty development, to promote faculty vitality, and to encourage excellence among tenured faculty. This is achieved by recognizing and rewarding faculty performance, offering suggestions to enhance performance, providing a clear plan and timetable for improvement of faculty members whose performance is found less than satisfactory, and providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions for those whose performance remains deficient. Post-tenure review shall be consistent with the University of North Carolina Board of Governors' policy of giving teaching primary consideration.

B. Faculty to Be Reviewed

PTR is required of all tenured faculty whose primary responsibilities (50% or more) involve teaching, scholarship, 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.

C. Timetable

A tenured faculty member may elect to undergo PTR during any academic year. Faculty for whom PTR is required must undergo a review no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent of any of the following review events: award of tenure or promotion at Western Carolina University, prior post-tenure review, or return to faculty status following administrative service. Exceptions shall be made in the following cases: 1) when on leave from duties, that period shall not be included as part of the five years between mandatory review events and/or 2) when temporarily assigned to duties away from Cullowhee/Asheville during the period of a required review, PTR occurs upon return. In the event of serious illness, childbirth or other compelling reasons, the ~~probationary period~~ PTR timetable may be extended by the Provost through a university process established, in consultation with and endorsed by the Faculty Senate, and approved by the Chancellor.

D. Materials to Be Submitted for Review

A faculty member being reviewed will provide the four most recent annual faculty evaluations and a current curriculum vitae (CV).

E. Procedures

Performance to be reviewed is limited to the five years preceding review or to the period subsequent to the prior review event, whichever is less.

The tenured faculty of each department shall establish a procedure for post-tenure review. These procedures must be approved by the dean of the college and the Provost. Each department establishes a PTR committee with at least three tenured departmental colleagues, excluding the department head. Whenever a department finds it impossible to form a committee containing at least three tenured faculty, the matter will be referred to the Provost. The Provost, in consultation with the tenured faculty of the department and the dean of the college, will, by selecting tenured faculty from similar departments, constitute a committee of three tenured faculty for the department.

Peer reviewers shall present their written evaluations to the department head. The department head shall provide a copy of this evaluation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty member to discuss

APPENDIX H

C:\DOCUME~1\adamson.AD\LOCALS~1\Temp\Working 4 00 Document_Nov 19 (RSB)FINAL.doc C:\Documents and Settings\byson\Desktop\Desk Files\AFE-TPR\AFE-TPR 08-09\Working 4 00 Document_Nov 19 (BTL).doc
8/20/2009 11:20/2008

the review. The department head shall then append his/her evaluation relative to the mission of the University, college/school/library, and program. The faculty member then has the option of attaching a written response. In the library the role of the department head will be performed by the University Librarian. When a department head is reviewed, the dean shall perform the roles ordinarily performed by the department head.

F. Criteria

Criteria for acceptable faculty performance include professional competence, conscientious execution of duties—taking into account distribution of workload as developed by the department head—and efforts to improve performance. Exemplary faculty performance, as determined by the department, involves sustained excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

G. Outcomes

Post-tenure review outcomes, including a faculty member's response to a negative review, in an academic unit must be reviewed by the ~~next higher administrative level (the Dean or Provost)~~ Dean. The Dean's decision, along with the Department's review will be sent to the Provost for information.

In the case of a satisfactory review, results are documented for university award and merit pay decisions. In addition, suggestions to enhance performance may be provided.

In the case of an unsatisfactory review, the department head, in consultation with the faculty member, PTR committee, and dean of the faculty member's college, will create a three-year development plan within one month of the review. The plan shall include (1) a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member's assigned duties; (2) specific improvements to be accomplished within three years, (3) resources to be committed to the improvement efforts, and (4) other support provided by the administration. 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. The department head and PTR committee will monitor the faculty member's progress relative to the development plan and provide verbal and written feedback to the faculty member semi-annually. The development plan and the written feedback are to be copied to the Dean and the Provost. In the event of serious illness, childbirth or other compelling reasons, the ~~probationary~~ PTR development period may be extended by the Provost through a university process established, in consultation with and endorsed by the Faculty Senate, and approved by the Chancellor.

The plan shall also include a clear statement of consequences should adequate progress not occur by the end of the third year. The consequences may range from suspension of pay raises to, in the most extreme cases, reduction in rank, temporary suspension of employment, or termination of employment.

H. Appeals

The Faculty Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee shall consider problems and appeals that arise from PTR.

I. Due Process

"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, suspended, or ~~diminished~~ demoted in rank only for reasons of incompetence, neglect of duty or misconduct of such a nature as to indicate that an individual is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty" (*Code of the University of North Carolina*, Chapter VI, Section 603). Disciplinary actions for noncompliance with the development plan are limited

APPENDIX H

C:\DOCUME~1\adamson.AD\LOCALS~1\Temp\Working 4 00 Document_Nov 19 (RSB)FINAL.doc C:\Documents and Settings\btysen\Desktop\Desk Files\AFE-TPR\AFE-TPR-08-09\Working 4-00 Document_Nov 19 (BTL).doc
8/20/2009 11/20/2008

to those established in Chapter VI of the *Code of the University of North Carolina*. Due process and the right of appeal as specified in the *Code of the University of North Carolina* and the "Tenure Policies and Regulations of Western Carolina University" in the Faculty Handbook shall be guaranteed.

APPENDIX H

Response to GA letters concerning WCU's PTR and TPR document (July 31, 2009).

GA Letter #1: Review of Post Tenure Review Policy:

1. (4.08 E page 25)

The tenured faculty of each department shall establish a procedure for post-tenure review. These procedures must be approved by the dean of the college and the Provost. Each department establishes a PTR committee (approved by the departmental faculty) with at least three tenured departmental colleagues, excluding the department head. Whenever a department finds it impossible to form a committee containing at least three tenured faculty, the matter will be referred to the Provost. The Provost, ~~in consultation with the~~ with the approval of the tenured faculty of the department and the dean of the college, will, by selecting tenured faculty from similar departments, constitute a committee of three tenured faculty for the department. Faculty members being reviewed are not permitted to select a member of the committee. However, this does not preclude such faculty members from voting on committee membership along with their colleagues.

2. (4.10 C2 page 40) The Faculty Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee. Why is this section needed? See note on GA letter dated May 13, 2009.

2. Duties and responsibilities

- a. The committee is authorized to hear, ~~mediate,~~ and advise with respect to the adjustment of grievances of faculty members of the general faculty who have concerns relating to the post-tenure review. The power of the committee is solely to hear representations by the persons directly involved in the appeal, ~~to mediate voluntary adjustments by the parties~~ and, to hold a hearing if necessary, and to inform appropriate administrative officials. The mediation hearing shall be conducted by someone other than a member of the Faculty Post-Tenure Review Committee and be closed to the public unless the faculty member requests otherwise. The decision of the Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee will be binding. Adjustment in favor of an aggrieved faculty member will be given to the Chancellor only after the dean, department head, or other administrative official most directly empowered to adjust it has been given similar advice and has not acted upon it within a reasonable time.
- b. Appeals within the province of this committee include all those matters related to the faculty member's post-tenure review status.

GA Letter #2 Review of Campus Tenure Related Policies:

1a. (4.03C2(2) page 5

- (2) Special faculty members who are paid shall be appointed for a specified term of service, as set out in writing in the letter of appointment. The term of appointment of any paid special faculty member concludes at the end of the specified period set forth in the letter of appointment, and the letter of appointment constitutes full and timely notice that a new term will not be granted when that term expires. However, full-time appointees at the rank of instructor or above (including lecturers and visiting assistant/associate/full professors) shall be given the notice of non-reappointment specified in Section 4.09B1. if the conditions of appointment to the rank of instructor or above include a provision that the appointment is subject to renewal.

APPENDIX H