

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

**Performance Review of Tenured Faculty  
2009-10**

**Introduction**

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

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

As a result of discussions held by the Personnel and Tenure Committee during 2006-2007, a review of post-tenure review policies and practices was undertaken that involved discussions with Chief Academic Officers, the UNC Faculty Assembly, and a committee appointed by Senior Vice President Martin to review relevant Board policies. As a result of these deliberations, the Board of Governors authorized revised Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty (*Guidelines* 400.3.3.1[G]) in March 2008 and a revised policy on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty (*Policy* 400.3.3) in October 2008. The revised Policy and Guidelines clarify and strengthen the expected processes and outcomes involved in performance review of tenured faculty. UNC constituent institutions reviewed and revised their campus post-tenure review policies and processes to align with the Board’s revisions.

### Outcomes of Performance Reviews

Information on the number and outcomes of the reviews was requested from chief academic officers (CAOs) for 2009-2010, the eleventh year in which reviews have been conducted. Based on their reports summarized in **Table 1**, 666 tenured faculty were reviewed, of which 21, or 3.2 percent, were found “deficient” based on institutional criteria. **Table 1** includes information on the outcomes of post-tenure performance review reported by UNC campuses for ten years (2000-01 through 2009-10). For the 21 faculty found deficient in 2008-09, 3 retired and dismissal procedures are underway for 1. Of the remaining 17, 11 continue to work on their development plan and 6 have satisfactorily completed theirs.

**Table 1. Ten-Year Post-Tenure Review Trends, 2000-01 to 2009-10**

| Year                  | Faculty Reviewed | Faculty Deficient | % Found Deficient |
|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 2000-2001             | 781              | 28                | 3.6%              |
| 2001-2002             | 690              | 24                | 3.5%              |
| 2002-2003             | 572              | 15                | 2.6%              |
| 2003-2004             | 1,106            | 19                | 1.7%              |
| 2004-2005             | 676              | 25                | 3.7%              |
| 2005-2006             | 690              | 14                | 2.0%              |
| 2006-2007             | 659              | 22                | 3.3%              |
| 2007-2008             | 648              | 20                | 3.1%              |
| 2008-2009             | 1,178            | 21                | 1.8%              |
| 2009-2010             | 666              | 21                | 3.2%              |
| <b>10-Year Totals</b> | <b>6,606</b>     | <b>209</b>        | <b>3.2%</b>       |

**Table 2** on the next page shows number of faculty found deficient in post-tenure performance reviews by campus during this decade. In some instances the data appear to indicate that there is some variation in how performance reviews of tenured faculty are conducted on campuses. The revised and strengthened policy and guidelines authorized by the Board of Governors and noted above may have the effect of reducing this variation in coming years.

**Table 2. Number of Faculty Found Deficient in Post-Tenure Reviews by Campus:  
2001-02 to 2009-10**

|                       | <b>01-02</b> | <b>02-03</b> | <b>03-04</b> | <b>04-05</b> | <b>05-06</b> | <b>06-07</b> | <b>07-08</b> | <b>08-09</b> | <b>09-10</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>ASU</b>            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 1            | 0            | 4            | 1            | 1            | 1            | <b>8</b>     |
| <b>ECU</b>            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 5            | 0            | <b>5</b>     |
| <b>ECSU</b>           | 1            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 2            | 2            | 1            | 0            | 1            | <b>7</b>     |
| <b>FSU</b>            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | <b>0</b>     |
| <b>NC<br/>A&amp;T</b> | 2            | 0            | 1            | 1            | 2            | 5            | 2            | 3            | 0            | <b>16</b>    |
| <b>NCCU</b>           | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 2            | 2            | 6            | <b>10</b>    |
| <b>NCSU</b>           | 14           | 14           | 9            | 13           | 4            | 1            | 6            | 6            | 2            | <b>69</b>    |
| <b>UNCA</b>           | 0            | 0            | 1            | 1            | 0            | 2            | 1            | 0            | 3            | <b>8</b>     |
| <b>UNC-<br/>CH</b>    | 7            | 0            | 3            | 5            | 2            | 4            | 3            | 3            | 5            | <b>32</b>    |
| <b>UNCC</b>           | 0            | 1            | 3            | 4            | 2            | 3            | 1            | 0            | 1            | <b>15</b>    |
| <b>UNCG</b>           | 0            | 0            | 1            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 2            | 0            | 0            | <b>3</b>     |
| <b>UNCP</b>           | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 2            | <b>2</b>     |
| <b>UNCW</b>           | 0            | 0            | 1            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | <b>1</b>     |
| <b>WCU</b>            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 1            | 1            | 1            | 1            | 0            | <b>4</b>     |
| <b>WSSU</b>           | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 1            | 0            | 0            | 0            | 0            | <b>1</b>     |
| <b>TOTAL</b>          | <b>24</b>    | <b>15</b>    | <b>19</b>    | <b>25</b>    | <b>14</b>    | <b>22</b>    | <b>20</b>    | <b>21</b>    | <b>21</b>    | <b>181</b>   |