

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

**Performance Review of Tenured Faculty
2010-11**

Introduction

Since 1998-99, the Division of Academic Affairs has collected campus data on the outcomes of post-tenure review. 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 clarified and strengthened 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 collected from campuses for 2010-11, the twelfth year in which reviews have been conducted. As summarized in **Table 1**, 690 tenured faculty members were reviewed, of which 18 (2.6%) were found “deficient” based on institutional criteria.

Table 1 includes information on the outcomes of post-tenure performance review reported by UNC campuses for the last ten years (2001-02 through 2010-11).

Table 1. Ten-Year Post-Tenure Review Trends, 2001-02 through 2010-11

Year	Faculty Reviewed	Faculty Deficient	% Found Deficient
2001-02	690	24	3.5%
2002-03	572	15	2.6%
2003-04	1,106	19	1.7%
2004-05	676	25	3.7%
2005-06	690	14	2.0%
2006-07	659	22	3.3%
2007-08	648	21	3.2%
2008-09	1,178	22	1.9%
2009-10	666	22	3.3%
2010-11	690	18	2.6%
10-Year Total	7,575	202	2.7%

Table 2 shows the number of faculty found deficient in post-tenure performance reviews by campus during the past ten years.

**Table 2. Number of Faculty Found Deficient in Post-Tenure Reviews by Campus:
2001-02 through 2010-11**

Institution	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Total
ASU	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	2	2	3	13
ECU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
ECSU	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	1	1	9
FSU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NC A&T	2	0	1	1	2	5	2	3	0	2	18
NCCU	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	1	12
NCSU	14	14	9	13	4	1	6	6	2	5	74
UNCA	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	3	1	9
UNC-CH	7	0	3	5	2	4	3	3	5	4	36
UNCC	0	1	3	4	2	3	1	0	1	0	15
UNCG	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
UNCP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
UNCW	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
WCU	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	5
WSSU	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	24	15	19	25	14	22	21	22	22	18	202

Table 3 shows the information by campus on: 1) initial performance reviews of tenured faculty conducted in 2010-11; and 2) the status of faculty found "deficient" as a result of performance reviews in 2007-08 through 2009-2010. More than one category of data may apply in this table; therefore, the sum of rows (b) i - v can be greater than the total number of faculty members given in row (a).

For the 22 faculty found deficient in 2009-10, 1 participates in a development plan; 5 retired; 2 were reviewed a second time and were found to be satisfactory; 11 continue to work under their development plan. Of the remaining 3, 1 is in the Phased Retirement Program and 2 were found deficient or unsatisfactory but refused to comply with the campus' mandatory development plan. The campus is addressing this issue.

Table 3. 2010-2011 Post-Tenure Review Survey Information by Institution

	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNC-CH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	TOTAL
2010-2011																
1. # of PTR conducted																
Tenured Professor	31	-	4	-	10	9	102	12	155	26	27	5	13	11	1	406
Tenured Associate Professor	9	2	1	-	25	6	42	8	83	27	25	3	19	15	1	266
Tenured Assistant Professor	-	-	-	3	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	10
Tenured Professional Librarians											8					
Total reviewed	40	2	5	3	37	16	144	20	238	53	61	9	33	27	2	690
2. # of Faculty as Reviewers	75	4	14	18	111	44	202	4	420	81	133	27	77	69	8	1287
3. Outcome																
a. deficient or unsatisfactory	3	-	1	-	2	1	5	1	4	-	-	-	-	1	-	18
b. satisfactory	7	1	1	3	14	8	139	19	69	53	59	9	18	26	1	427
c. above average	-	-	2	-	-	3	-	-	44	-	2	-	7	-	-	58
d. superior	30	1	1	-	21	4	-	-	121	-	-	-	8	-	1	187
Total	40	2	5	3	37	16	144	20	238	53	61	9	33	27	2	690
Status of Faculty Found "Deficient"																
2007-2008																
(a) # found deficient or unsatisfactory	1	-	2	-	2	2	6	1	3	1	2	-	-	1	-	21
(b) # of these faculty members who:																
i. participated in mandatory devel. plan	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	1	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	10
ii. Retired	1	-	1	-	-	2	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	9
iii. Reviewed a 2nd time & "satisfactory"	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	6
iv. Cont. to work under mand. dev. plan	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
v. other (please explain)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
2008-2009																
(a) # found deficient or unsatisfactory	2	4	-	-	3	3	6	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	22
(b) # of these faculty members who:																
i. participated in mandatory devel. plan	-	3	-	-	-	-	6	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
ii. Retired	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
iii. Reviewed a 2nd time & "satisfactory"	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
iv. Cont. to work under mand. dev. plan	-	1	-	-	1	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	7
v. other (please explain)	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
2009-2010																
(a) # found deficient or unsatisfactory	2	-	1	-	-	6	2	3	5	1	-	2	-	-	-	22
(b) # of these faculty members who:																
i. participated in mandatory devel. plan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
ii. Retired	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
iii. Reviewed a 2nd time & "satisfactory"	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	2
iv. Cont. to work under mand. dev. plan	1	-	-	-	-	2	2	3	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	11
v. other (please explain)	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3