

COMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL AND TENURE

November 11, 2004

TENTATIVE AGENDA

1. Minutes of the October 7, 2004 meeting.
2. *Recommendations for Administrative Appointments
3. *Salary Increases
4. Management Flexibility to Appoint and Fix Compensation
 - *Appalachian State University*
5. Report on Phased Retirement Program
6. Report on Post-Tenure Review
7. Teaching Awards Assignment Review
8. Proposed Amendments to Policy 600.3.4, "Management Flexibility to Appoint and Fix Compensation"
9. Non-Salary Compensation Policies
10. Other Business

ACTION ITEMS FOR THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS MEETING - *For the Consent Agenda, as recommended for approval by the Committee at the October 7, 2004 meeting: amendments to Policy 300.1.1 "Senior Academic and Administrative Officers"*

*The Committee will discuss these items in Closed Session.

COMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL AND TENURE

Thursday, October 7, 2004 at 3:00 p.m. in Board Room 2, in the General Administration Building,
910 Raleigh Road, Chapel Hill, NC

Minutes of Meeting October 7, 2004

Committee members present at the meeting included: Mr. John W. Davis III, Mr. Brent D. Barringer, Dr. Dudley E. Flood, Mr. Peter Keber (acting as Chair), Mr. Charles H. Mercer, Jr., and Dr. Patsy B. Perry. Board of Governors members included: Mr. J. Bradley Wilson, Mr. William L. Burns, Jr., Mrs. Anne W. Cates, and Ms. Amanda DeVore. Office of the President staff attending were: President Molly Corbett Broad, Dr. Gretchen M. Bataille and Ms. Lisa Adamson. Ms. Jane Stancill of the *News and Observer* also attended a portion of the meeting.

The minutes of the September 9, 2004 meeting were approved as distributed.

Mr. Keber asked for a motion to go into Closed Session “to establish or instruct the staff or agent concerning the negotiation of the amount of compensation or other terms of an employment contract; to consider the qualifications, competence, performance, condition of appointment of a public officer or employee or prospective public officer or employee; to hear or investigate a complaint, charge, or grievance by or against a public officer or employee.” [N.C.G.S. §143.318.11(a)(5)&(6)]

*The meeting was **moved into closed session.***

(The complete minutes of the Closed Session are recorded in Appendix A.

The Committee returned to open session.

The Committee discussed the proposed amendments to Policy 300.1.1 “Senior Academic and Administrative Officers,” relating to the prohibition of supplementing salaries of Senior Academic and Administrative Officers from foundation funds. Mr. Keber distributed an article from the October 2004 issue of Trusteeship, the AGB journal, on this subject. Other amendments to the Policy addressed the issue of discharge for cause of “at will” employees. It was noted that this did not apply in athletic departments, as coaches and athletic directors often had employment agreements. The motion was made and seconded for recommendation for approval by the Board of Governors at the November meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Bataille presented the 2004-2005 Annual Report for the Committee on Personnel and Tenure and the Annual Report on the Distinguished Professors Endowment Trust Fund. She noted that due to the increase in funds granted by the

General Assembly, the backlog of Endowed Professorships that were waiting to be funded with State funds has been cleared. She stated that the Distinguished Professors Endowment Trust Fund would receive eight million dollars from the General Assembly next year to fund new Endowed Professorships. The motion was made and seconded for recommendation for approval by the Board of Governors. Motion passed unanimously.

The Committee received the “*Annual Summary Report*” from campuses with management flexibility (East Carolina University, North Carolina State University, The University of North Carolina at Asheville, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, The University of North Carolina at Wilmington, Western Carolina University and Winston-Salem State University.) The Committee received the 2004-2005 salaries for Senior Academic and Administrative Officers from the nine campuses with management flexibility.

As there were no further items for discussion, the meeting was adjourned.

Mr. Charles H. Mercer, Jr., Secretary

Attachments

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

Survey of Phased Retirement Program Participants

November 11, 2004

Executive Summary

During fall semester 2003, the University of North Carolina surveyed faculty participating in the UNC Phased Retirement Program. The on-line survey was conducted in conjunction with a survey of all UNC faculty members aged 50 and over designed to gather information about senior faculty members' aspirations, plans, and concerns pertaining to late career and retirement. Ninety-six (96) usable responses to the Phased Retirement survey were received, representing approximately 21% of all faculty members enrolled in the program since its implementation in 1998 and 46% of those employed in the program in fall 2003.

Responses to the Phased Retirement Program (PRP) survey suggest that the program is fulfilling its dual purposes of providing UNC faculty members an opportunity to transition into retirement gradually and improving UNC institutions' personnel planning related to retirements. The overwhelming majority of respondents to the survey are satisfied with the program: 93% would make the same decision again, and 90% would recommend the program to colleagues. Respondents report few difficulties with the enrollment process. They had enough time and information to make an informed decision to enter the program, received helpful information and consultation from institutional staff, and understood the impact of the program on their salary, benefits, and institutional privileges.

Survey respondents were overwhelmingly male, white, and married. Nearly 75% held the rank of professor. Their mean age was 65, with an average of 30 years at their current institutions and over 35 years in higher education. Phased retirees report teaching slightly fewer courses in their half-time PRP assignments than they did when working full-time. Compared to their work before entering the program, they spend slightly more time on research and scholarship, slightly less time in public service, and significantly less time in administration. Slightly over 20% work outside the University or in self-employment. Many report that they are involved in volunteer activities and spend more time in activities with friends, family members, or in community activities in Phased Retirement. One-third spend time caring for a child or an elderly or sick relative.

Respondents report a mean combined income that is 90% of their institutional income before retiring in PRP (including salary, retirement benefits, Social Security, and other income). Most report that their income in PRP is about what they expected

when entering the program. The vast majority (69%) chose Phased Retirement because they wanted to transition into retirement. Nearly 90% expect to stay in Phased Retirement for the entire period of their contracts. When asked whether they would have continued to work full-time or would have retired fully if they had not entered PRP, 84% responded that they would have continued to work full-time, for an average 4.3 years.

The survey results have a number of implications for campus and University-wide personnel planning and policies. (See “Implications of the Survey Responses,” page 11.) In general, Phased Retirement Program participants are very satisfied with the program. However, the program is allowing faculty members to move to part-time work who would not otherwise have retired for several years, apparently because they want to transition into retirement and would have continued to teach full-time rather than retiring fully were the PRP not available. This pattern of delaying full retirement may change as the economy and faculty salaries improves and the cohort of faculty eligible for PRP ages; institutions will need to monitor retirement patterns to determine the impact on PRP and campus personnel planning.

In addition, these survey results, in conjunction with those of the Senior Faculty Survey, suggest that the number of participants in Phased Retirement might be increased if the program were perceived as more attractive by larger numbers of faculty nearing retirement. Additional analysis of the responses to both surveys and research targeted more directly on the attractiveness of various aspects of the program could inform revisions to the program. Institutions need to consider the advantages and disadvantages of increased participation in PRP versus full retirement on personnel planning, particularly as they face the possibility of faculty shortages as a result of growing enrollments and retirements among the cohort of faculty aged 55 and over.

The UNC Phased Retirement Program

The Phased Retirement Program for Tenured Faculty was implemented in 1998 for a five-year trial period at the 15 constituent institutions of the University of North Carolina where tenure exists. In 2001, the UNC Board of Governors voted to continue the program as a benefit for UNC faculty. The program was designed “to promote renewal of the professoriate in order to ensure institutional vitality and to provide additional flexibility and support for individual faculty members who are nearing retirement.” The program has three major goals: better personnel planning, enhanced recruitment and retention, and increased quality of faculty (*UNC Policy Manual*, 300.7.2.1 [G]).

The Phased Retirement Program enables full-time tenured faculty who meet eligibility requirements to relinquish tenure and enter into a contract to work half time for 50% of their salary during their last year of full-time employment. To be considered eligible for participation in the program, faculty must meet the following criteria:

- tenured full-time faculty member;
- at least 50 years old;

- at least five years of service at the current institution; and
- eligible to receive retirement benefits either through the North Carolina Teachers and State Employees Retirement System (TSERS) or under the UNC Optional Retirement Program (ORP).

The Board's policy allows each institution to set caps on participation in order to ensure the quality of academic programs and to define the length of the phased retirement contract period for all faculty (contracts can range from one and five years, although all campuses now have either a two- or three-year contract). Responsibilities and schedules for participating faculty are individually negotiated at the campus level.

Survey Methodology

During fall semester 2003, the University of North Carolina surveyed faculty participating in the UNC Phased Retirement Program. The survey was conducted in conjunction with a survey of all UNC faculty members aged 50 and over that was designed to gather information about senior faculty members' aspirations, plans, and concerns pertaining to late career and retirement. The web-based Phased Retirement Program survey was posted and responses collected by the College of Management at NCSU.¹

E-mail addresses were collected from UNC offices of institutional research by the UNC Office of the President Division of Planning and Assessment for every employee with a faculty appointment who was 50 years or older on June 30, 2003. Invitations to participate were sent via email to the selected population and signed by Dr. Betsy Brown, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs at the Office of the President, and Dr. Jeffrey Passe, Chair of the UNC Faculty Assembly, which had voted its support of the survey in spring 2003.

A total of 6690 email invitations were sent to UNC faculty who were in the target populations for the senior faculty and phased retirement surveys. Ninety-six (96) usable responses to the PRP survey were received; email queries about the survey indicated that some respondents had already completed their PRP contracts but had been rehired part-time by their institutions. Thus, responses represent faculty who are current or past participants in the PRP. By fall semester 2003, a total of 455 UNC faculty members had entered Phased Retirement since its beginning in 1998, and a total of 208 faculty members were participating in PRP during that semester. The 96 responses to the PRP survey represent approximately 21% of all faculty enrolled in the program since its implementation and 46% of those employed in the program in fall 2003.

INSTITUTION:*	# OF RESPONSES	% OF RESPONSES
Appalachian State University	13	13.5%
East Carolina University	14	14.6%
Elizabeth State University	2	2.1%
Fayetteville State University	1	1.0%
North Carolina Central University	2	2.1%
North Carolina State University	20	20.8%
UNC Asheville	1	1.0%
UNC Chapel Hill	16	16.7%
UNC Charlotte	6	6.3%
UNC Pembroke	1	1.0%
UNC Wilmington	5	5.2%
Western Carolina University	13	13.5%
Winston-Salem State University	2	2.1%
Total	96	

* NC School of the Arts does not offer the Phased Retirement Program. Problems with email addresses from UNC Greensboro resulted in no UNCG responses, and no responses were received from NC A&T.

Analysis of Responses to the Survey

(Percentages for items below may exceed 100% due to rounding.)

I. Demographic, Academic, and Financial Profile of PRP Respondents

Survey respondents were overwhelmingly male, white, and married. Nearly 75% held the rank of professor. Their mean age was 65, with an average of 30 years at their current institutions and over 35 years in higher education. Nearly one-third had held an administrative appointment before entering Phased Retirement, with 58% of their appointments assigned to administrative roles.

Mean Age:	65 Years
-----------	----------

Gender	80.2% male 16.6% female 3.1% no response
--------	--

Marital Status:	84.4% Married 8.3% Widowed, Divorced, Separated 2.8% Living w/Domestic Partner 5.2% Unmarried, Living Alone
Mean spouse age:	62.5 years
% with children under 21 years	6.4%

Racial/ethnic identify:	92.7% White 3.1% African American
-------------------------	--------------------------------------

	4.16% Other
--	-------------

ACADEMIC RANK:	74.0% PROFESSOR 20.8% ASSOCIATE 4.2% ASSISTANT 1.0% OTHER
Administrative appointment:	31.6% held administrative roles before PRP 58% of assignment to administration

MEAN YEARS AT CURRENT INSTITUTION:	30.0
Mean years in higher education:	35.5

The demographics and proportional representation of institutions represented in the responses point to a continuing concern about the low participation rates in the program by faculty at minority-serving institutions. Respondents from these campuses represent 12% of the total survey responses, and faculty members at these institutions represent only 11% of enrollments in Phased Retirement since the program began.

II. Faculty Workload Before and During PRP

The survey included questions about the respondents' workload before and after entering Phased Retirement. Sixty percent of the respondents work at their institutions during both academic semesters. Respondents report teaching slightly fewer courses in their half-time PRP assignments than they did when working full-time (2.45 hours during PRP compared to 2.76 before). Compared to their full-time positions before entering the program, they report spending a slightly higher percentage of their time on research and scholarship (29.6% in PRP compared to 27.7% before), slightly less of their time in public service (7.3% in PRP compared to 7.4% before) and, as might be expected, significantly less time in administration (9.9% in PRP compared to 24.2% before).

Over 40% report spending an average 16.9 hours per week involved in research and creative or scholarly activities. Over 20% report spending an average of 11.5 hours per week in paid non-University work or self-employment. A third spend an average of 7 hours per week participating in volunteer activities, and two-thirds now spend more time in activities with friends, family members, or in community activities. One-third report spending time caring for an elderly or sick relative.

	BEFORE PRP	DURING PRP
Number of assigned courses:	2.76	2.45
% time spent on research/scholarship:	27.7%	29.6%
% public service:	7.4%	7.3%

% administration	24.2%	9.9%
% other	ERR	13.8%

SEMESTERS WORKED UNDER PRP:	BOTH	60.6%
	One	39.4%

	Percent Participating	Mean Hours/Week
Non-University work/self-employment:	21.8%	11.5
Research/creative/scholarly activities:	42.7%	16.9
Volunteer activities:	33.3%	7.0
Activities with friends, family, community:	67.7%	NA
Providing assistance to family members (child or an elderly or sick relative):	33.3%	NA
Other	20.8%	NA
None of the above	1.0%	NA

Responses about institutional work and other activities include several unexpected patterns. In addition to teaching, respondents remain involved in a significant amount of research activity during their phased retirement, more than they were involved in before their retirement. This result may reflect the heavy proportional representation among respondents of faculty from research extensive and research intensive campuses: 58% (even without responses from UNCG).

III. Retirement Plans, Pre-Retirement Earnings, and Retirement Income

Approximately two-thirds of faculty enrolled in PRP participated in the Teachers' and State Retirees' Retirement System, with the other third participating in Optional Retirement Plans. Eighty percent had been enrolled in their retirement plan for over 25 years.

Based on a mean income of slightly over \$94,000 from all sources before entering PRP, respondents report receiving a mean retirement benefit equal to approximately 39% of pre-retirement income, with combined incomes in PRP (including salary, retirement benefit, Social Security, and other income) representing a mean 90% of their income before retiring. Most respondents report that their income in PRP is about what they expected when entering the program.

Salary and other income before entering PRP:

Mean salary from institution:	\$83,593
Mean other institutional income:	\$ 6,153
Mean income from other sources:	\$ 4,390
Mean total income:	\$94,137

RETIREMENT PLAN:	
TSERS	67.4%
ORP	32.6%
Years participating in Retirement Plan:	
30+ years	64.5%
25-29	15.1%
20-24	9.7%
15-19	5.4%
10-14	3.2%
5-9	2.2%
Received monthly retirement benefit immediately upon entering PRP?	
Yes	90.5%
No	9.5%
Received Social Security benefit immediately upon entering PRP?	
Yes	57.9%
No	42.1%

RETIREMENT BENEFITS AS % OF INSTITUTIONAL EARNINGS BEFORE PRP:	39.2%
Combined income as % of institutional earnings before PRP:	90.0%
Combined income in PRP about what was expected?	
Yes	94.7%
No	5.3%

Information on respondents' financial situation during Phased Retirement suggest that the program offers participants several years of financial security before fully retiring: respondents' income from all sources averaged 90% of their institutional income before retiring, even though only 60% received Social Security benefits as they entered the program. Particularly in an uncertain economic period, the program appears to allow faculty members to transition to retirement gradually financially as well as in terms of their commitment to their institutions.

IV. Entering Phased Retirement

The survey asked respondents about their PRP contracts, their retirement plans if they had not entered PRP and their reasons for entering the program. The largest percentage (78%) report having 3-year PRP contracts; nearly 90% expect to stay in Phased Retirement for the entire period of their contracts.

The vast majority of respondents (69%) chose Phased Retirement because they wanted to transition into retirement; another 10% chose the program because they planned to pursue other interests. Fewer than 10% reported entering the program

because they could not afford to retire fully (7.3%) or because of changing University policies (6.3%) or the implementation of post-tenure review (1.0%).

When asked whether they would have continued to work full-time or retired fully if they had not entered PRP, 84% responded that they would have continued to work full-time, for an average 4.3 years. This response may reflect participants' desire to transition gradually into retirement, although it may also be a short-term result of concerns about adequate income in full retirement; faculty members who could not enter Phased Retirement might otherwise have chosen to continue teaching rather than retiring fully.

Length of PRP contract:

2 years	1.1%
3 years	77.9%
5 years	21.1%
Expect to stay for maximum years in PRP:	89.3%
Expect to retire fully before end of contract:	10.8%

Would have continued to work full-time without PRP:

Yes	84.0%
No	16.0%
Number of additional years worked without PRP:	4.3 years

PRIMARY REASON FOR ENTERING PRP:

Wanted to transition into retirement	68.8%
Planned to pursue other interests	9.4%
Could not afford to retire fully	7.3%
Changing University policies	6.3%
Implementation of post-tenure review	1.0%
Planned to pursue other employment	1.0%
Other	6.3%

V. Satisfaction with Enrollment Process and PRP

The survey asked about the sources of information respondents consulted before entering PRP and their satisfaction with the information they received. They were also asked to indicate their agreement with a number of statements related to their satisfaction with the PRP enrollment process and their experience in the program.

Most respondents learned about the program first through written correspondence from their institutions (65%) and consulted the campus benefits officer before deciding to enter the program (81%). Seventy percent attended an information session on the program offered by their institutions, and the majority found the sessions helpful and the questions they asked about the program answered

satisfactorily. Fewer than 40% consulted a financial advisor before entering the program, and only 4% consulted an attorney.

Over 90% agreed or strongly agreed that the application process was easy to follow, that they had sufficient time and information to make an informed decision about entering the program, and that they understood the impact of the program on their salary, benefits, and institutional privileges.

A total of 93% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were pleased with their participation in the program and would make the same decision again. Ninety percent would recommend the program to colleagues.

How did you first become aware of eligibility for PRP:

Written communication from institution	64.5%
Colleague	18.3%
Information session	8.6%
Institution website	2.2%
Other	6.5%

Sources of information consulted before entering PRP:

UNIVERSITY BENEFITS OFFICER	81.3%
Benefit calculation program	51.0%
Knowledgeable family member or friend	37.5%
Financial advisor	32.3%
Attorney	4.2%

Attended an information session sponsored by institution:

Yes	70.7%
No	29.4%

Helpfulness of the session:

Very helpful	34.9%
Helpful	40.9%
Somewhat helpful	21.2%
Not helpful	3.0 %

Sufficient information about PRP to make an informed decision:

Strongly agree	46.2%
Agree	47.3%
Disagree	5.4%
Strongly disagree	1.1%

Application process allowed time to make an informed decision:

Strongly agree	48.9%
Agree	45.6%
Disagree	4.4%
Strongly disagree	1.1%

Application process was easy to follow:

Strongly agree	38.0%
Agree	47.8%
Disagree	13.0%
Strongly disagree	1.1%

Questions asked of PRP officials answered satisfactorily:

Strongly agree	41.2%
Agree	47.0%
Disagree	9.4%
Strongly disagree	2.4%

Understood impact on salary upon entering PRP:

Strongly agree	41.3%
Agree	55.4%
Disagree	3.3%

Understood impact on benefits upon entering PRP:

Strongly agree	44.6%
Agree	48.9%
Disagree	3.3%
Strongly disagree	3.3%

Understood impact on University privileges and services upon entering PRP:

Strongly agree	43.3%
Agree	47.8%
Disagree	6.7%
Strongly disagree	2.2%

Pleased with participation in PRP, would make the same decision again:

Strongly agree	60.0%
Agree	33.3%
Disagree	5.6%
Strongly disagree	1.1%

Would recommend PRP to colleagues:

Strongly agree	59.3%
Agree	30.2%
Disagree	5.8%
Strongly disagree	4.6%

Implications of the Survey Results

Responses to the Phased Retirement Program survey suggest that the program is fulfilling its dual purposes of providing UNC faculty members an opportunity to transition into retirement gradually and improving UNC institutions' personnel planning related to retirements. In addition, the results have implications for institutions in light of the increasing large number of UNC faculty becoming eligible to participate in the program.

I. Implications for Personnel Planning:

- The overwhelming majority of respondents to the survey are satisfied with the program: 93% would make the same decision again, and 90% would recommend the program to colleagues. Respondents report few difficulties with the enrollment process; they had enough time and information to make an informed decision to enter the program. These results highlight the importance of institutional representatives in informing eligible faculty members and consulting with them about the program. The availability of timely information and well-informed institutional staff are essential to the continuing success of the program.
- The majority of respondents report working half-time for both semesters, an arrangement that some campus representatives find preferable to working full-time for one semester because it allows departments to maintain course rotations and carrying out such responsibilities as student advising. A large percentage (90%) of respondents intend to work for the full term of their PRP contracts, a result that should reassure departments that their workloads can be met as phased retirees fulfill the responsibilities of their contracts. A relatively low percentage (22%) report other paid off-campus work or self-employment during their Phased Retirement contracts; some concern was voiced when the program was implemented that faculty members in large numbers would seek part- or full-time jobs in addition to their Phased Retirement contracts.
- The small number of faculty members responding to the survey from UNC minority-serving institutions parallels the low rate of participation in the Phased Retirement Program at these institutions. (See attached chart, *First-Time Phased Retirement Participants, 1998 Through 2003*.) This gap in participation among institutions is a cause for concern, and further research may be needed to determine why faculty at minority-serving institutions are not entering the program. If they determine that higher participation rates will be of value both to faculty members and the institution, minority-serving campuses in particular may want to ensure that faculty members receive sufficient and timely information about the program and that participants' satisfaction with the program is reported more widely.

II. Implications for Faculty Development and Benefits:

- Many Phased Retirement Program participants continue to be significantly involved in research and scholarly activities. This fact should prompt institutions

to consider the professional development support available to phased retirees and to increase this support as appropriate.

- Reports by a third of the respondents that they spend time caring for a child or elderly or sick relative suggests that dependent care and other benefits provided to senior and retired faculty members may need to be examined in light of this significant commitment by phased retirees.

III. Implications for Revisions to the Phased Retirement Program:

- Survey results have significant implications for the retention of senior faculty members as institutions confront the movement of an increasingly large cohort of faculty into retirement. The demographic profile of respondents suggests that the program is serving a population with significant service both to their institutions and to higher education. Phased Retirement can offer institutions an opportunity to retain these valuable faculty members who might otherwise retire fully.

However, the fact that 84% of respondents indicated that they would have continued to work full time, for an average of 4.3 years, if the program had not been available suggests that participants may be retiring earlier in lieu of continuing to work full-time because of PRP. This pattern may change as the cohort of senior faculty members ages and economic prospects improve, potentially attracting more senior faculty to retire fully and should be monitored.

- Responses to the Survey of Senior Faculty aged 50 and over, administered at the same time as the Phased Retirement Program survey, suggest that the University may be able to influence participation through changes in the program. Thirty-one percent of respondents to the Senior Faculty Survey indicated that they plan to enter Phased Retirement; this is approximately the same percentage of retiring tenured faculty who have entered PRP during the life of the program (34%). However, written comments on the Senior Faculty Survey (not yet fully analyzed) include a number of responses indicating that the program is perceived as not attractive and that it should be a “better deal.” These responses suggest that the percentage of faculty members retiring in order to enter the program might be increased with a program perceived to be more attractive to faculty nearing retirement. Additional analysis of these responses and research targeted more directly on the attractiveness of various aspects of the program could inform revisions to the Phased Retirement Program to make it more or less attractive, depending on whether institutions find advantages or disadvantages in increased participation.

The Office of the President and institutions will continue to monitor Phased Retirement trends carefully to determine whether the program should be promoted because it is helping retain experienced senior faculty (as intended) or reconsidered because it may be encouraging their loss through earlier retirement and the move to half-time employment. If it is determined that the program is effective in retaining senior faculty, greater efforts may be needed to inform faculty about the program, and departmental and institutional caps may need to be reconsidered to retain more senior faculty in at least part-time positions as the percentage of younger faculty,

many of them hired in non-tenure track positions, increases. The importance of the Phased Retirement Program and other programs targeted toward sustaining and retaining senior faculty members will increase in light of the projected need for over 10,000 new and replacement faculty members at UNC institutions in the current decade.

First-Time Phased Retirement Participants 1998 Through 2003

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002*	2003*	1998 - 2003
ASU	4	6	3	15	3	7	38
ECU	16	17	8	8	2	2	53
ECSU	--	--	2	4	--	2	8
FSU	1	1	--	--	--	--	2
NCA&T	1	1	--	--	1	--	3
NCCU	6	--	2	4	1	6	19
NCSU	13	9	15	15	6	13	71
UNC-A	--	4	2	1	--	1	8
UNC-CH	9	7	20	20	13	17	86
UNC-C	7	2	7	7	7	8	38
UNC-G	6	4	8	3	3	5	29
UNC-P	3	3	2	2	6	--	16
UNC-W	5	3	12	8	3	--	31
WCU	6	8	16	4	11	5	50
WSSU	2	--	1	--	--	--	3
UNC Summary	79	65	98	91	56	66	455

UNC-GA Prog Assess/PDF.CH239/14AUG02
and Campus Revisions 7 Feb 03
October 18, 2004

¹ Thanks to Professors Robert Clark and Steve Allen of NCSU and Ms. Kitty McCollum of the UNC Office of the President for their assistance in developing the survey and to Professor Allen and his student, Chris Spencer, for programming and posting the survey and collecting and reporting the responses.

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

Performance Review of Tenured Faculty
1998-2004

November 11, 2004

Since 1998-99, the Division of Academic Affairs has collected data on the outcomes of post-tenure review from chief academic officers and, in some years, from deans and department chairs. 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.”

Data on the outcomes of post-tenure review are 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 2003-2004, information was again requested from chief academic officers (CAOs) on the number and outcomes of the last year’s reviews. (The data collection form sent to CAOs is attached.)

Reports on the outcomes of post-tenure review available for six years (1998-99 through 2003-2004) indicate the following outcomes for the University as a whole: *

Outcomes of Post Tenure Review, 1998-2004

Year	Faculty Reviewed	Faculty Deficient	% Found Deficient
1998-1999	1162	16	1%
1999-2000	914	42	5%
2000-2001	781	28	4%
2001-2002	690	29	4%
2002-2003	572	13	2%
2003-2004	1106	23	2%
6-Year Totals	5,225	151	3%

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

The six-year percentage of faculty found deficient as a result of post-tenure review, 3%, is well within the range of such percentages reported by other state systems (which have ranged from 2% to 9%).

These results should be viewed in light of the fact that tenured faculty at UNC institutions are reviewed rigorously during their probationary years and when they are granted tenure, during an annual evaluation process including the chair and, in many cases, departmental peers, and when they are promoted 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.

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

NCSA Mid-Ten-Year Review

Although the North Carolina School of the Arts does not award tenure and thus is not required to comply with the policies and procedures for performance review of tenured faculty, the School has elected to adopt a mid-ten-year contract evaluation that is consistent with the purposes and processes of the Board's policy for post-tenure review. Effective 2004-2005, NCSA faculty members will be reviewed in the fifth year of a ten-year contract; the evaluation will involve the dean and a peer committee and is designed "to support and encourage excellence among faculty, to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality." Faculty who receive less than satisfactory ratings will prepare, with the dean, an individual development or career plan, including annual goals and specific steps, resources, and support structures for improvement, with a clear statement of consequences should performance not improve.

Five-Year Evaluation of Post-Tenure Review

In 2003, after five years of post-tenure review and data collection representing a full five year “cycle” of reviews as required by the Board’s policy, preliminary conclusions were drawn that, on the whole, the process had been successfully implemented and that most campuses had developed workable post-tenure review processes as part of a comprehensive faculty evaluation system. (See Report to the Personnel and Tenure Committee, “Performance Review of Tenured Faculty 1998-2003,” November 13, 2003.)

However, the Division of Academic Affairs, working with the IFWL Committee, has developed a pilot project for a more comprehensive campus and system-wide review of policies, procedures, outcomes, benefits, and problems related to post-tenure review. The evaluation is intended to help campuses and the Office of the President develop recommendations for strengthening the value and effectiveness of post-tenure review for individual faculty members, their institutions, and the University as a whole.

Plans for the evaluation began in October 2003, when 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. While most of the participants in the discussion 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. The Committee and Dr. Licata concluded that the evaluation should be campus-based and should include a survey of faculty who have been reviewed and/or served as peer reviewers as well as academic administrators who have been involved in the evaluation process.

Three campuses volunteered to pilot the evaluation, but only one, Appalachian State University, has completed the survey, which has been adapted from a survey used widely across the country which was developed by Dr. Licata for the American Association for Higher Education.* Campus administrators and faculty are currently analyzing the results. It is hoped that at least two additional campus evaluations will be completed this year. The Personnel and Tenure Committee will receive updates on the evaluation along with annual reports on the outcomes of post-tenure review at UNC campuses.

* See Christine M. Licata and Betsy E. Brown. *Post-Tenure Faculty Review and Renewal: Reporting Results and Shaping Policy*. Boston, MA:Anker Publishing, 2004.

University of North Carolina Office of the President
Post-Tenure Review Survey, 2003-2004
 (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 2003-2004.

<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 2003-2004.

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, 2001-2002, or 2002-2003:

<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) _____

<u>2002-2003</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)	_____

Return by August 2, 2004 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)
 919-843-5327 (Fax)
brownb@northcarolina.edu