

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

**Performance Review of Tenured Faculty**  
**2005-2006**

**DATE**

**Executive Summary**

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}). The guidelines state that 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.”

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. Information received from the UNC chief academic officers (CAOs) for 2005-2006 indicates that 690 tenured faculty were reviewed, of which 13, or 2%, were found “deficient” based on institutional criteria. Reports on the outcomes of post-tenure review available for eight years (1998-99 through 2005-2006) indicate that 188 or approximately 3% of faculty reviewed have been found deficient. This percentage has varied from 1% to 5% since the program was implemented; UNC’s eight-year percentage is well within the range of such percentages reported by other state systems (which have ranged from 2% to 9%).

Follow-up reports on the status of 180 faculty members who were evaluated as “deficient” during the five-year period 2000-01 through 2004-05 indicate that UNC institutions are acting on the results of the reviews to ensure that underperformers are being assisted through development plans or are leaving the institutions through retirement, resignation, or dismissal. Nearly half (47.2%) of the faculty members evaluated as “deficient” during these five years had retired, resigned, been dismissed, or dismissal procedures are in progress.

## **DRAFT**

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

#### **Performance Review of Tenured Faculty 2005-2006**

## **DATE**

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}). The guidelines state that

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.”

#### **Outcomes of Performance Reviews**

Information on the number and outcomes of the reviews was requested from chief academic officers (CAOs) for 2005-2006, the eighth year in which reviews have been conducted. Based on their reports, 690 tenured faculty were reviewed, of which 13, or 3%, were found “deficient” based on institutional criteria. The table below includes information on the outcomes of post-tenure review reported by UNC campuses for eight years (1998-99 through 2005-2006):

## DRAFT

### Outcomes of Post-Tenure Review, 1998-2005\*

Year	Faculty Reviewed	Faculty Deficient	% Found Deficient
1998-1999	1,162	16	1%
1999-2000	914	42	5%
2000-2001	781	28	4%
2001-2002	690	29	4%
2002-2003	572	13	2%
2003-2004	1,106	23	2%
2004-2005	676	24	4%
2005-2006	690	13	3%
<b>8-Year Totals</b>	<b>6,591</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>3%</b>

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

The eight-year percentage of faculty found deficient as a result of post-tenure review, approximately 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 1,000-1,500 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.

### Follow-Up on Previous Reviews

In their 2006 reports, UNC chief academic officers reported on the status of 180 faculty members who were evaluated as “deficient” during the five-year period 2000-01 through 2004-05. These reports provide the following information about the status of these faculty members:

- 35 (32.4%) participated in a mandatory development plan and, when reviewed a second time, were evaluated as performing satisfactorily
- 21 (19.4%) continue to work under a mandatory development plan.
- 21 (19.4%) have retired.
- 16 (14.8%) had resigned.
- 14 (12.9%) had been dismissed or dismissal procedures are on-going.
- 1 (1%) was given an adjusted workload.

According to these reports, nearly half (47.2%) of the faculty members evaluated as “deficient” during these five years had retired, resigned, been dismissed, or dismissal procedures are in progress. These follow-up reports suggest that although a small percentage of faculty members are evaluated by their peers as performing below expectations, UNC institutions are acting on the results of the reviews to ensure that underperformers are being assisted through development plans or are leaving the institutions through retirement, resignation, or dismissal.

## DRAFT

### 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 Innovations in Faculty Work Life, developed a plan 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.

Appalachian State University has administered a survey, adapted from a survey used widely across the country which was developed by Dr. Christine Licata for the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), on a number of aspects related to the review process. Campus administrators and faculty have reviewed the results and are using them as the basis for a revision of the post-tenure review process. North Carolina State University has included several questions adapted from the AAHE survey in its Faculty Well-Being Survey, to be administered Fall 2006. Other institutions have undertaken reviews of their policies and procedures; at North Carolina A&T State University, a faculty task force reviewed and proposed revisions which have in use since 2004-2005. At two institutions, Fayetteville State University and the University of North Carolina at Pembroke, no faculty have been evaluated as “deficient” since Performance Review of Tenured Faculty was implemented in 1998-99. In 2006-07, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Harold Martin will discuss the usefulness of an evaluation of the policy and procedures for Performance Review of Tenured Faculty at all UNC campuses that award tenure.

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