

3. Performance Review of Tenured Faculty

Situation: Presentation of the fifteenth Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, or Post-Tenure Review.

Background: These processes on campuses are intended 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 performance of faculty found deficient, and include a recommendation for discharge, in the most serious cases, for those whose performance remains deficient, providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions.

Assessment: A total of 698 faculty were reviewed over the past year, of which 24 were deemed deficient based on BOG and institutional criteria.

Action: This is for information only.

The University of North Carolina

Performance Review
of Tenured Faculty

2012 - 2013



The University of North Carolina
General Administration

January 2014

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.
3. Include a recommendation for discharge, in the most serious cases, for those whose performance remains deficient, providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions.¹

University of North Carolina (UNC) campuses developed their own policies and procedures within the Board’s requirements, which included the following:

1. Each campus must ensure a cumulative review no less frequently than every five years for each tenured faculty member.
2. Involve peers as reviewers.
3. Include written feedback to faculty members as well as a mechanism for faculty response to the evaluation.
4. 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.

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. See Appendix A for links to every UNC campus’ post-tenure review policies.

¹ UNC Policy Manual, 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1 {G}

Outcomes of Performance Reviews

As part of the fifteenth year in which post-tenure reviews have been conducted, information was collected from campuses for 2012-13. Across all campuses in 2012-13, tenured faculty represented 42% of full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty. As summarized in Table 1, 698 tenured faculty members were reviewed in 2012-13, of which 24 (3.4%) 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 (2003-04 through 2012-13).

Table 1. Ten-Year Post-Tenure Review Trends, 2003-04 to 2012-13

Year	Faculty Reviewed	Faculty Deficient	% Found Deficient
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%
2011-12	779	30	3.9%
2012-13	698	24	3.4%
10-Year Total	7,790	217	2.8%

Source: UNC-GA IRA/WG002/20SEP13

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

Table 2. Number of Faculty Found Deficient in Post-Tenure Reviews: 2003-04 to 2012-13

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	Total Faculty Found Deficient
ASU	-	1	-	4	1	2	2	3	2	2	17
ECU	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	4
ECSU	-	-	2	2	2	-	1	1	-	-	9
FSU	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	3
NC A&T	1	1	2	5	2	3	-	2	2	-	18
NCCU	-	-	-	-	2	3	6	1	1	1	14
NCSU	9	13	4	1	6	6	2	5	7	7	60
UNCA	1	1	-	2	1	-	3	1	-	2	11
UNC-CH	3	5	2	4	3	3	5	4	13	7	49
UNCC	3	4	2	3	1	-	1	-	-	3	18
UNCG	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	4
UNCP	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2
UNCW	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
WCU	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	1	2	-	7
WSSU	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
TOTAL	19	25	14	22	21	22	22	18	30	24	217

Source: UNC-GA IRA/WG003/20Sept13

For the post-tenure review process in 2012-13, the majority of tenured faculty reviewed were full tenured professors (61.6%) with associate tenured professors (38.0%), assistant tenured professors (0.3%), and tenured librarians (0.1%) also being reviewed. Twenty-four faculty were deemed “deficient” or “unsatisfactory” by teams of peer reviewers. The percent of “deficient” or “unsatisfactory” for this academic year was lower than the previous year (3.4% compared to 3.9% in 2011-12). Post-tenure reviews were overwhelmingly positive with 63.8% of the faculty receiving satisfactory performance reviews, 10.3% were deemed above average, and 22.5% were given superior performance reviews. See Appendix B for more details.

As part of the post-tenure review process conducted at each campus, those tenured faculty deemed “deficient” or “unsatisfactory” will begin working with their departments on mandatory development plans as detailed in each campus’ policies and procedures related to UNC Policy Manual, 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1G.

The majority of faculty found to be “deficient” or “unsatisfactory” over the last three academic years participated in and completed (or continue to participate in) mandatory development plans. Some faculty have fully retired in conjunction with the post-tenure review findings and others have begun phased retirements. Details of last year’s post-tenure review results and their current status can be found in Appendix C.

Appendix A

Campus	Link to Policy on Post-Tenure Review
Appalachian State University	http://facultyhandbook.appstate.edu/sites/facultyhandbook.appstate.edu/files/Faculty%20Handbook%20092612.pdf
East Carolina University	http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/currentfacultymanual/part9section2.pdf
Elizabeth City State University	http://www.ecsu.edu/administration/legal/docs/policymanual.pdf
Fayetteville State University	http://www.uncfsu.edu/documents/policy/employment/Post-Tenure_Review_Rev1.pdf
NC A&T	http://www.ncat.edu/provost/docs/Post-Tenure%20Review%20-%20Amended-Fall%202009.pdf
North Carolina Central University	http://www.ncc.edu/formsdocs/proxy.cfm?file_id=1921
NC State University	http://policies.ncsu.edu/category/personnel/faculty/post-tenure-review-ptr-rules
UNC Asheville	http://www3.unca.edu/aa/handbook/3.htm#3.7
UNC-Chapel Hill	https://provost.unc.edu/policies/students-and-programs/post-tenure-review-policy/
UNC Charlotte	http://legal.uncc.edu/policies/up-102.14
UNC Greensboro	http://provost.uncg.edu/documents/personnel/posttenurereview.pdf
UNC Pembroke	http://www.uncp.edu/aa/handbook/12-13/12-13.pdf
UNC Wilmington	http://uncw.edu/facsen/documents/Faculty_Handbook.pdf#page=100
Western Carolina University	http://www.wcu.edu/WebFiles/PDFs/2013_14_Fac_Handbook_FINAL_ONLINE_8_1_13.pdf
Winston-Salem State University	http://www.wssu.edu/administration/officeof-the-provost

Appendix B

2012-13 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
1. # of PTR conducted																
Tenured Professor	28	4	10	14	9	9	98	8	172	15	16	15	16	13	3	430
Tenured Associate Professor	14	2	1	1	8	6	55	6	53	36	35	6	22	14	6	265
Tenured Assistant Professor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
Tenured Professional Librarians	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Total reviewed	42	6	11	15	17	15	153	14	225	51	52	22	38	28	9	698
% reviewed of total tenured faculty	9.0%	1.0%	14.7%	11.0%	6.7%	9.7%	19.1%	11.3%	24.4%	10.3%	12.8%	16.3%	10.2%	12.9%	10.7%	13.3%
2. # of Faculty as Reviewers																
	65	1	17	162	45	31	226	4	270	79	130	66	112	68	23	1,299
3. Outcome																
a. deficient or unsatisfactory	2	-	-	2	-	1	7	2	7	3	-	-	-	-	-	24
b. satisfactory	19	4	-	7	10	8	146	12	61	48	52	22	21	28	7	445
c. above average	-	-	2	-	-	6	-	-	62	-	-	-	-	-	2	72
d. superior	21	2	9	6	7	-	-	-	95	-	-	-	17	-	-	157
Total	42	6	11	15	17	15	153	14	225	51	52	22	38	28	9	698

Source: UNC-GA IRA/WG004/20Sep13

Appendix C

Faculty Found “Deficient” 2011-12

	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNC-CH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	TOTAL
(a) # found deficient or unsatisfactory	2	-	-	1	2	1	7	-	13	-	1	-	1	2	-	30
(b) # of these faculty members who participated in mandatory development plan	1	-	-	1	2	-	7	-	11	-	-	-	-	1	-	23
(c) # of these faculty members received their first “deficient” or “unsatisfactory”	2	-	-	-	2	1	2	-	13	-	1	-	1	2	-	24
(d) # of these faculty members who:																
i. Reviewed a second time & “satisfactory”	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
ii. Continue to work under mandatory development plan	1	-	-	1	-	1	6	-	8	-	-	-	-	1	-	18
iii. Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	3
iv. other (see below)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	3

Explanation:

UNC-CH: one moved to another university and one resigned

UNCW: the faculty member found deficient passed away

Source: UNC-GA IRA/WG005/20Sep13