

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

**November 13, 2003**

**Performance Review of Tenured Faculty**  
**1998-2003**

**Background**

Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, adopted by the Board in May 1997 based on the recommendations of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review, 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})*

The Board recognized that, within broadly defined principles, each institution’s policies and procedures for review would reflect the mission of the institution and that developing a system of post-tenure review would require re-examination of the effectiveness of current faculty personnel policies as well as planning and program review policies.

The Board’s policy mandates that campus policies for Performance Review of Tenured Faculty must

- encompass and acknowledge the importance and significance of annual performance reviews while providing for comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review;
- 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;
- 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;
- consider the resources necessary to support and facilitate a meaningful review system and its outcomes.

Campus policies and procedures vary in several ways, such as the means by which faculty are selected for review in a given year, the selection and composition of the peer review committee, the materials to be submitted for review, and the procedure for monitoring the development of faculty found deficient. In addition, while some campuses explicitly link rewards to performance in post-tenure review, others incorporate the results of post-tenure review into their existing reward systems.

### **Data Collection and Outcomes**

Since 1998-99, the Division of Academic Affairs has collected data from each campus on the outcomes of post-tenure review from chief academic officers and, in some years, from deans and department chairs. These data have been reviewed by Academic Affairs staff and shared with the Innovations in Faculty Work Life (IFWL) Committee, which was appointed by the President in 1999 to monitor the implementation of post-tenure review, among other committee charges. For 2002-2003, information was

requested from chief academic officers (CAOs) on the number and outcomes of last year's reviews. (The data collection form sent to CAOs is attached.)

Data on the outcomes of post-tenure review available for five years (1998-99 through 2002-2003) indicate the following outcomes for the University as a whole: \*

### **Outcomes of Post Tenure Review, 1998-2002**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Faculty Reviewed</b>	<b>Faculty Deficient</b>	<b>% Found Deficient</b>
1998-1999	1162	16	<b>1%</b>
1999-2000	914	42	<b>5%</b>
2000-2001	781	28	<b>4%</b>
2001-2002	690	29	<b>4%</b>
2002-2003	572	13	<b>2%</b>
<b>5-Year Totals</b>	<b>4119</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>3%</b>

\* Some totals for previous years have been recalculated based on corrected numbers received from campuses.

The five-year percentage of faculty found deficient as a result of post-tenure review, 3%, is well within the range of such percentages in other statewide systems. Based on information obtained by Academic Affairs, annual percentages of deficient faculty ratings for large statewide systems with similar post-tenure review policies have ranged from 2% to 9%.

It is important to note that of the over 10,000 full-time faculty in the UNC system, slightly over 50% are tenured. These faculty members were reviewed rigorously for reappointment during their probationary years on the tenure track and when they were granted tenure. Each participates in an annual evaluation process including the chair and, in some cases, departmental peers. Many have also demonstrated the achievements necessary for promotion to the rank of professor. Thus, it is not surprising that the great majority of tenured faculty University-wide would be found to be performing at a satisfactory level of performance.

In addition, each year approximately 1,000 UNC faculty members serve as peer reviewers for the post-tenure review process, a significant commitment of faculty time and effort to the review process, especially when added to the time and effort of the faculty being reviewed, department chairs, deans, and chief academic officers. For 2000-2001, CAOs estimated the average time required by those involved in the process. Most CAOs' reported that the reviews required from 1 to 14 hours by faculty being reviewed, from 3 to 6 hours by peer reviewers and committee chairs, from 1 to 5 hours by department chairs, and from 1 to 2 hours for deans. (See *Performance Review of Tenured Faculty 1998-2001*.)

In 2002-2003, CAOs were asked for follow-up information on faculty found deficient in the first four years of post-tenure review. As in previous years, their reports indicate that faculty members who received unsatisfactory ratings were required to complete development plans or, in some cases, continue previously developed plans. Others were reviewed after completing their plans and received satisfactory evaluations. These reports suggest that academic leaders are monitoring the completion of mandatory development plans and taking appropriate action when faculty performance does not improve. Chief academic officers reported that of the 115 faculty members reviewed as unsatisfactory between 1998-1999 and 2001-2002, 25 (approximately 22%) had retired by academic year 2002-2003.

### **Five-Year Evaluation**

After five years of post-tenure review and data collection, the preliminary conclusions in previous reports on post-tenure review are still valid: on the whole, the process has been successfully implemented and most campuses have developed workable

post-tenure review processes as part of a comprehensive faculty evaluation system (which also includes reviews for reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as peer reviews of teaching and annual reviews by department chairs). Faculty found deficient have participated in mandatory development plans, and satisfactory reviews have led to recommendations for rewards, including merit pay and nominations for faculty awards. Both satisfactory and unsatisfactory reviews have resulted in discussion with chairs and colleagues and clearer understanding about expectations for performance in many departments.

However, five years of post-tenure review also demonstrate that the results have not been consistent across institutions. Ratings at four larger institutions, NCA&T, NCSU, UNCC and UNC-CH, account for most of the deficient ratings during the first five years of implementation. At three institutions (FSU, UNCP, and WSSU), no faculty members have been found deficient, while at the remainder of institutions from one to four faculty have been found deficient. (North Carolina School of the Arts does not award tenure and thus does conduct post-tenure review under the Board's policy.) In addition, in various years one or more institutions did not implement reviews, either because of changes in personnel at the dean or provost level or because the institution was developing or revising its policy and procedures.

Academic year 2002-2003 marked the completion of the first five-year cycle of post-tenure review at UNC campuses, during which all faculty members tenured as of 1998 should have been reviewed. The Division of Academic Affairs, working with the IFWL Committee, is developing a plan for comprehensive campus and system-wide review of policies, procedures, outcomes, benefits, and problems. In October 2003, Dr.

Christine Licata of the Rochester Institute of Technology, a recognized expert on post-tenure review nationally, met with an expanded IFWL Committee to discuss participants' perceptions about the effectiveness of the process on their campuses and how the comprehensive evaluation should proceed. Participants were asked to complete a questionnaire about post-tenure review on their campuses before the meeting, and the results were discussed at the meeting.

While most of the participants believed that the purpose of the reviews was clear and that the review process, timeline, documentation, procedures, and criteria were clear to faculty, opinions were mixed about such aspects of the process as the nature and responsibility of the peer review committee, the adequacy of follow-up after reviews, and the adequacy of administrative support and resources for the process. Participants identified the following as benefits from the process: the opportunity for faculty to improve their teaching, research, and service; encouragement of faculty productivity; affirmation of contributing faculty members; identification of poorly performing faculty; and the value of the reviews for determining merit and providing an overview of long-term performance. Weaknesses identified by the participants included the following: inconsistency in the application of review criteria; the perception by some faculty members that the process was punitive; the lack of resources for development and lack of rewards for exemplary performance; the time burden imposed by the process; and concern about the commitment of peer reviewers in an effective review process.

The discussion clearly demonstrated that the effectiveness and benefits of the process vary considerably across institutions and, in some cases, within institutions in which criteria and procedures vary across academic units. The participants agreed with

Dr. Licata that the five-year evaluation should be focused at the campus level, with some elements consistent across all institutions and some elements designed to address the particular concerns about the process on individual campuses. Working with Dr. Licata, Academic Affairs will develop a set of questions to be answered by faculty members and academic administrators on each campus, either through surveys or focus groups, about how to make post-tenure review at UNC more effective. In addition, campuses will be asked to develop evaluation procedures to address the particular concerns of faculty and academic administrators on their campuses and to report on changes to policies and procedures to ensure a more effective review process.

This plan will be shared with the chief academic officers at their meeting in November 2003. Several campuses may volunteer to pilot the evaluation in spring semester 2004; after the pilot, the evaluation can be adapted for UNC-wide use during academic year 2004-2005. The Personnel and Tenure Committee will receive a progress report on the evaluation and modifications to campus procedures in 2004. A report and recommendations will be made to the Board during 2005, which may include recommendations for modifications of the policy and guidelines.

**University of North Carolina Office of the President  
COVER SHEET**

**Post-Tenure Review Survey, 2002-2003**  
(To be completed by the Chief Academic Officer)

Name of University \_\_\_\_\_

Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs \_\_\_\_\_

1. Number of post-tenure reviews conducted for entire campus during 2002-2003.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Number</u>
Tenured Professor	_____
Tenured Associate Professor	_____
Tenured Assistant Professor	_____

2. Total number of faculty who served as reviewers. \_\_\_\_\_

3. Outcome of reviews completed in 2002-2003.

Number of faculty whose performance was found to be  
“deficient” or “unsatisfactory.” \_\_\_\_\_

Number of faculty whose performance was found to be  
“satisfactory.” \_\_\_\_\_

Number of faculty whose performance was found to be  
“above average” or “superior” (if applicable). \_\_\_\_\_

4. Status of faculty found “deficient” as a result of reviews in 1998-99, 1999-2000, 2000-2001, or 2001-2002:

<u>1998-99</u>	<u>Number</u>
----------------	---------------

Number of faculty reported by institution as being found  
“deficient” or “unsatisfactory.” \_\_\_\_\_

Number of these faculty members who

participated in mandatory development plan.....	_____
retired .....	_____
were reviewed a second time and found “satisfactory” .....	_____
continue to work under a mandatory development plan .....	_____
other (please explain below) .....	_____



1999-2000 Number

Number of faculty reported by institution as being found  
“deficient” or “unsatisfactory” \_\_\_\_\_

Number of these faculty members who  
participated in mandatory development plan..... \_\_\_\_\_  
retired ..... \_\_\_\_\_  
were reviewed a second time and found “satisfactory” ..... \_\_\_\_\_  
continue to work under a mandatory development plan ..... \_\_\_\_\_  
other (please explain below) ..... \_\_\_\_\_

2000-2001 Number

Number of faculty reported by institution as being found  
“deficient” or “unsatisfactory” \_\_\_\_\_

Number of these faculty members who  
participated in mandatory development plan..... \_\_\_\_\_  
retired ..... \_\_\_\_\_  
were reviewed a second time and found “satisfactory” ..... \_\_\_\_\_  
continue to work under a mandatory development plan ..... \_\_\_\_\_  
other (please explain below) ..... \_\_\_\_\_

2001-2002 Number

Number of faculty reported by institution as being found  
“deficient” or “unsatisfactory” \_\_\_\_\_

Number of these faculty members who  
participated in mandatory development plan..... \_\_\_\_\_  
retired ..... \_\_\_\_\_  
were reviewed a second time and found “satisfactory” ..... \_\_\_\_\_  
continue to work under a mandatory development plan ..... \_\_\_\_\_  
other (please explain below) ..... \_\_\_\_\_

**Return by August 1, 2003 to:**  
**Betsy E. Brown, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs**  
**The University of North Carolina Office of the President**  
**P. O. Box 2688, Chapel Hill NC 27515-2688**  
**919-962-4613 (Phone)**  
**919-962-7139 (Fax)**  
**brownb@northcarolina.edu**