5.   Performance Review of Tenured Faculty…………………………………………Warwick Arden/Kate Henz

Situation: Presentation of the sixteenth 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 and provide a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found deficient. Revisions to policy and guidelines were approved by the BOG and President Ross in 2014. This report reflects reviews conducted under the previous policy and guidelines.

Assessment: A total of 1,434 faculty were reviewed over the past year, of which 38 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

2013-14

The University of North Carolina
General Administration

October 2014

Introduction

Since 1998-99, the Division of Academic Affairs has collected campus data on the outcomes of post-tenure review.[1] Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, or post-tenure review, was adopted by the Board of Governors (BOG) 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 unsatisfactory.
3. Include a recommendation for discharge, in the most serious cases, for those whose performance remains unsatisfactory, providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions.[2]

University of North Carolina (UNC) campuses developed their own policies and procedures within the BOG'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.

In June 2014, the BOG approved a revised policy on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty (400.3.3) and President Ross approved Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty (400.3.3.1[G]) "...to assure the continuing rigorous application of post-tenure review as intended by the Board of Governors." With the goal of strengthening the post-tenure review process, each campus is required to update and submit their post-tenure review policies to UNC General Administration (UNC-GA) by May 2015 for approval. According to the guidelines, UNC-GA "will evaluate the training and post-tenure review processes...during the 2015-16 fiscal year" to ensure compliance and conduct subsequent reviews every three years.

The data presented in this report reflect the previous policy language and the categories of post-tenure review outcomes presented herein align with previous reporting conventions. See Appendix A for links to the current post-tenure review policies for every UNC campus that grants tenure. The 2015-16 report will reflect the new policies implemented on each campus.

---

1   UNC School of the Arts and NC School of Science and Math do not award tenure
2   UNC Policy Manual, 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1 [G]

Outcomes of Performance Reviews

As part of the sixteenth year in which reviews have been conducted, information for 2013-14 post-tenure review activities was collected from campuses. Across all campuses, tenured faculty accounted for 39% of all faculty and those eligible for post-tenure reviews (tenured faculty with more than five years of tenure) accounted for 25% of all faculty.

As summarized in Table 1, 1,434 tenured faculty members across the system were reviewed in 2013-14, 38 (2.6%) of whom were found "unsatisfactory" based on institutional criteria.[3] Table 1 includes information on the outcomes of post-tenure performance review reported by UNC campuses for the last ten years.

The increases in total faculty reviewed in 2008-09 and 2013-14 deserve a note of explanation. From the beginning of the post-tenure review process, the majority of East Carolina University's academic units chose to review tenured faculty in the same year. Thus, they review most faculty every fifth year. This is in contrast to other campuses that choose to review a subset of tenured faculty every year.

Table 1. Ten-Year Post-Tenure Review Trends, 2004-05 to 2013-14

Year	# Faculty Reviewed	# of Faculty Found Unsatisfactory	% Found Unsatisfactory
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%
2013-14	1,434	38	2.6%
10-Year Total	8,118	236	2.9%

Source: UNC-GA IRA/WG002/20SEP14

---

3   Under the previous policy, the various campus outcomes of post-tenure reviews were grouped and presented in BOG reports as "unsatisfactory," "satisfactory," "above average," and "superior." Under the new policy that will be implemented in the 2015-16 fiscal year, the review categories will be at least "exceeds expectations," meets expectations," and "does not meet expectations."

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

Table 2: Number of Faculty Found Unsatisfactory in Post-Tenure Reviews: 2004-05 to 2013-14

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Total Faculty Found Unsatisfactory
ASU	1	-	4	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	19
ECU	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	16	20
ECSU	-	2	2	2	-	1	1	-	-	1	9
FSU	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	4
NC A&T	1	2	5	2	3	-	2	2	-	3	20
NCCU	-	-	-	2	3	6	1	1	1	2	16
NCSU	13	4	1	6	6	2	5	7	7	4	55
UNCA	1	-	2	1	-	3	1	-	2	1	11
UNC-CH	5	2	4	3	3	5	4	13	7	5	51
UNCC	4	2	3	1	-	1	-	-	3	1	15
UNCG	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	3
UNCP	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	3
UNCW	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	2
WCU	-	1	1	1	1	-	1	2	-	-	7
WSSU	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
TOTAL	25	14	22	21	22	22	18	30	24	38	236

Source: UNC-GA IRA/WG002/20SEP14

For this post-tenure review cycle, the majority of tenured faculty reviewed were tenured associate professors (53.9%), with full tenured professors (45.1%), assistant tenured professors (0.7%), and tenured librarians (0.3%) also being reviewed. Thirty-eight faculty (2.6%) were deemed "unsatisfactory" by teams of peer reviewers, which is a lower percentage than the previous year. Post-tenure reviews were overwhelmingly positive with 62.0% of the faculty receiving satisfactory performance reviews, 4.3% deemed above average, and 31.1% given superior performance reviews. See Appendix B for more details.

Once a faculty member receives an "unsatisfactory" review, they work closely with their departments to make improvements and are reviewed annually until their performance is deemed "satisfactory." Progress of these faculty are monitored closely by departments, deans, and colleges to improve performance. The length of time in the plan differs by campus, typically ranging between one to three years. Nearly all of the faculty given "unsatisfactory" reviews in 2013-14 received this designation for the first time and they have begun working with their departments on mandatory develop-

ment plans as detailed in each campus' policies and procedures related to UNC Policy 400.3.3.

Faculty found to be "unsatisfactory" over the last three post-tenure review cycles participated in and completed (or continue to participate in) mandatory development plans. Some faculty have retired in conjunction with the post-tenure review findings and others have begun phased retirements or other types of approved leave. For details regarding last year's post-tenure review results and their current status, see Appendix C.

In 2013-14, there were a small number of tenured assistant professors and tenured librarians reviewed across UNC campuses. Only a few campuses provide tenure to and review librarians, which helps to explain the small numbers for that category. For tenured assistant professors, there are two primary reasons for the relatively small number being reviewed that are detailed in UNC Policy 400.3.3.1[G] and supported by campus information. First, there are very few assistant professors eligible for post-tenure review, as the majority of faculty with this rank have not been granted tenure. In 2013, of the 5,565 faculty eligible for post-tenure review, only 65 (1.2%) held the rank of assistant professor. Of these 65 assistant professors, 10 were reviewed during this post-tenure review cycle. Second, a review undertaken to decide promotion to a higher rank is considered a cumulative review, satisfying the requirement for a review every five years and further explaining why the numbers for tenured assistant professors being reviewed is so low.[4] Many assistant professors with tenure may choose to apply for a tenure promotion to the rank of associate professor and are therefore not counted as having undergone a post-tenure review for the purposes of this report.

---

4   See UNC Policy 400.3.3.1[G] under Guideline #2 for language regarding granting tenure or deciding on promotion serving as a cumulative review.

Appendix A

Campus Post-Tenure Review Policies[5]

Campus	Link
Appalachian State University	facultyhandbook.appstate.edu/
East Carolina University	www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/currentfacultymanual/part9section2.pdf
Elizabeth City State University	www.ecsu.edu/administration/legal/docs/policymanual.pdf
Fayetteville State University	www.uncfsu.edu/documents/policy/employment/Post-Tenure_Review_Rev1.pdf
NC A&T	www.ncat.edu/provost/docs/Post-Tenure%20Review%20-%20Amended-Fall%202009.pdf
North Carolina Central University	www.nccu.edu/formsdocs/proxy.cfm?file_id=2824
NC State	policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-05-20-04
UNC Asheville	www3.unca.edu/aa/handbook/3.htm#3.7
UNC-Chapel Hill	provost.unc.edu/policies/students-and-programs/post-tenure-review-policy/
UNC Charlotte	legal.uncc.edu/policies/up-102.14
UNC Greensboro	provost.uncg.edu/documents/personnel/posttenurereview.pdf
UNC Pembroke	www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/faculty-handbook
UNC Wilmington	uncw.edu/facsen/documents/Faculty_Handbook.pdf#page=97
Western Carolina University	www.wcu.edu/WebFiles/WordDocs/APR4EmploymentPol.docx
Winston-Salem State University	www.wssu.edu/administration/officeof-the-provost

---

[5] UNC School of the Arts and NC School of Science and Math do not award tenure

Appendix B

2013-14 Post-Tenure Review Survey Information by Institution

	ASU	ECU¹	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNC-CH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	TOTAL
1. # of PTR conducted																
Tenured Professor	36	239	8	5	10	12	109	3	149	17	24	7	19	7	2	647
Tenured Associate Professor	26	433	4	4	24	12	69	8	64	46	35	11	20	16	1	773
Tenured Assistant Professor	-	8	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	10
Tenured Professional Librarians	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	4
Total reviewed	**63**	**680**	**12**	**9**	**34**	**25**	**178**	**11**	**213**	**63**	**60**	**18**	**40**	**25**	**3**	**1,434**
2. # of Faculty as Reviewers	75	303	10	191	102	46	257	4	388	70	116	54	116	79	7	1,818
3. Outcome																
Unsatisfactory	2	16	1	1	3	2	4	1	5	1	-	1	1	-	-	38
Satisfactory	37	391	6	6	13	14	174	10	58	62	60	17	20	21	-	889
Above Average	*	*	1	*	*	5	*	*	50	*	*	*	*	4	1	61
Superior	24	273	4	2	18	4	*	*	100	*	*	*	19	-	2	446
Total	**63**	**680**	**12**	**9**	**34**	**25**	**178**	**11**	**213**	**63**	**60**	**18**	**40**	**25**	**3**	**1,434**
4. Unsatisfactory Faculty																
Unsatisfactory for the first time	1	16	1	1	3	2	1	1	4	1	-	1	1	-	-	33
Unsatisfactory for the second time or more	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Total	**2**	**16**	**1**	**1**	**3**	**2**	**4**	**1**	**5**	**1**	**-**	**1**	**1**	**-**	**-**	**38**

¹ECU evaluates nearly all faculty once every five years, with this data showing that they reviewed nearly all eligible faculty in 2013-14. The percent reviewed for ECU is of all tenured faculty.

*Campus does not include this category as a possible outcome of post-tenure reviews.

Appendix C

Faculty Found "Unsatisfactory" in 2012-13

This chart reports on the ongoing progress of faculty deemed "unsatisfactory" during the 2012-13 post-tenure review process.

	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNC-CH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	TOTAL
# found unsatisfactory	2	-	-	2	-	1	7	2	7	3	-	-	-	-	-	24
# of unsatisfactory faculty members who:																
i. Reviewed again & deemed "satisfactory"	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
ii. Continue to work under mandatory development plan	-	-	-	1	-	-	4	1	6	3	-	-	-	-	-	15
iii. Retired	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
iv. Other	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2

Source: UNC-GA IRA/WG005/20Sep14