

4. Post-Tenure Review Working Group.....GA Sywassink/Suzanne Ortega

**Situation:** The Personnel and Tenure Committee requested the creation of the Post-Tenure Review Working Group to review both the Post-Tenure Review Policy (400.3.1) and Guidelines (400.3.1 G) and recommend changes to improve the rigor and consistency of the process.

**Background:** The Working Group provided an update and draft changes to the Guidelines during the last meeting of the Personnel and Tenure Committee at its February meeting.

**Assessment:** The Post-Tenure Review Working Group submits edits to create greater alignment between post-tenure review and the annual review, clarifying the process of the second-level review required by current guidelines, providing training opportunities for all individuals involved in the review process, the creation of an audit function to ensure compliance, and the creation of consistent assessment categories.

**Action:** This item is for review

*Post-Tenure Review Working Group  
Recommendations*

---



**The University of North Carolina General Administration**

**April 2014**

This report summarizes the work and recommendations of the post-tenure review working group. Membership of the working group consisted of the following, Mr. GA Sywassink, Chair of the working group and Vice Chair of the Board of Governors Committee on Personnel and Tenure; Mr. Therence Pickett, member of the Board of Governors Committee on Personnel and Tenure; Chancellor David Belcher of Western Carolina University; Chancellor Harold Martin of North Carolina A&T State University; Dr. Marilyn Sheerer, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at East Carolina University; Dr. David Barlow, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Fayetteville State University; and Dr. Catherine Rigsby, Chair of the Faculty Assembly. Dr. Suzanne Ortega, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs acted as staff to the committee.

The Committee was charged with examining current system and campus post-tenure review policies and practices to identify ways in which they can be strengthened with an emphasis on consistency, rigor and accountability. The working group was tasked with submitting recommendations to the President on the inclusion of practices to strengthen the guidelines governing post-tenure review and recommend any changes to UNC Policy.

The Committee conducted a series of in-person and teleconference meetings between January 24, 2014 and March 11, 2014. During these meetings and subsequent discussion the working group reviewed 400.3.3.1[G] and identified several changes or clarifications which would strengthen the post-tenure review process while also increasing the effectiveness of performance evaluations. These include, greater alignment between annual performance reviews and post-tenure review, clarification of the process of a second level of review beyond the department chair or unit head, providing training opportunities for those involved in the post-tenure review evaluation process, auditing of compliance with training and process regulations, and the creation of three assessment categories.

Appendix A is a red-line version of the policy showing the suggested edits.

### **Greater Alignment Between Annual Performance Reviews and Post-Tenure Review**

The current guidelines direct campuses to ensure their policies show a relationship between the annual performance review of tenured faculty and the post-tenure review and specifies that annual performance reviews are not substitutes for the “comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review.” To better align annual performance reviews and post-tenure review, the working group recommends that the post-tenure review be based on a set of directional goals proposed by the faculty member at the beginning of the review cycle. These directional goals should act as a guide for the professional growth of the faculty member over the coming five-year period. Milestones created in these goals will act as the basis for annual reviews. Directional goals should be approved by the department chair. The working group felt it was important to recognize that changes in circumstances could necessitate changes in these directional goals and therefore included language in the proposed guideline edits which allows for annual modifications as deemed appropriate.

### **Clarification of the Process of a Second Level Review**

The current guidelines currently require that post-tenure review outcomes be reviewed at one or more higher administrative levels. To increase consistency throughout the system, the working

group proposes that the Deans must provide an evaluative review in addition to the review conducted by the peer review committee and the department chair. The Provost will be required to certify that all aspects of the post-tenure review process for that year are in compliance with policy and guidelines. Department chairs/unit heads are often in difficult positions when it comes to evaluating faculty within their departments. They are organizationally situated immediately beside faculty colleagues and often return to faculty ranks to later be evaluated by someone whom they once had the responsibility to evaluate. The recommended change not only provides greater consistency across the system regarding who is involved in the post-tenure review process but also provides an opportunity to the review process to be more meaningful for the faculty member undergoing the review and builds in additional support for department chairs and unit heads. Under the proposed revision, faculty will be receiving feedback from a peer review committee but also department chairs/unit heads and the Dean.

### **Providing Training Opportunities**

As the working group discussed the goals of the post-tenure review process as noted in the policy, to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance, providing a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found deficient, and providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions. The working group feels strongly that post-tenure review should be a positive and useful process that both recognizes strong performance and provides constructive criticism to strengthen the performance and provide professional growth of the faculty. The current guidelines neglect to include a mechanism by which evaluators are prepared to provide such feedback. The working group recommends that institutions be provided ongoing support and training for all post-tenure review evaluators, including peer committee members, department chairs/unit heads, and deans. UNC General Administration will be responsible for preparing digital training modules for campus use. The modules will focus on the essential elements of a useful and thoughtful review: how to prepare, conduct and manage a meaningful review process and how to provide constructive criticism in a positive manner. The Provost will be charged with certifying that training is being conducted.

### **Auditing Compliance**

One of the pieces of the charge to the working group was to identify ways in which the post-tenure review process could be strengthened by identifying areas where greater consistency could be achieved across the system. One such area is compliance reporting. The current guidelines offer an unstructured form of compliance reporting and therefore is conducted differently across the system. The working group recommends implementing a compliance audit to ensure that training and processes are being conducted according to policy. UNC General Administration will be responsible for conducting training and process audits of all campuses during the 2015-2016 fiscal year. In subsequent years, process audits will be conducted of all campuses on a three-year rotating cycle unless irregularities are identified.

## **Assessment Categories**

The current policy notes recognition and reward of exemplary faculty performance as one of the three purpose of post-tenure review. The working group therefore recommends that each campus utilize three levels of assessment for their faculty, meets expectations, exceeds expectations, and does not meet expectations. These three categories will not only provide consistency across the system in terms of evaluation metrics, but also satisfies one of the main goals of the post-tenure review policy, to recognize exemplary faculty performance. Without the three assessment categories, faculty with exemplary performance are not identified and therefore cannot be recognized. The working group recognizes that absent funding, recognition of exemplary performance can be challenging but felt there were other avenues of recognition outside of salary increases. Examples of these alternatives include, course-release time, professional development funding, and public recognition.

## **Conclusion**

In summary, the post-tenure review working group sought to identify areas in which the post-tenure review policy and guidelines could be strengthened. Specifically, the working group wished to identify areas where greater consistency could be achieved in implementing policy across the system. These recommendations seek to achieve this outcome by creating three assessment categories and including the Dean as an evaluative reviewer within the post-tenure review process. An additional outcome of this review was to increase the rigor and accountability of the process. Recommendations for the inclusion of an auditing process, including the Dean as an evaluative reviewer, and providing training opportunities all contribute to strengthening the rigor of the post-tenure review process. Additionally, the post-tenure review working group felt strongly that the post-tenure review process should be positive in nature and allow for recognition of exemplary performance as well as a constructive evaluation process by which faculty could continue to grow professionally. Providing training for all individuals involved in the post-tenure review process assists reviewers in strengthening their evaluation skills. Training also increases the probability that faculty will receive the types of feedback that is most helpful and valuable to their individual growth and contribution to the institution.

These recommendations have been shared with faculty assembly and are currently being reviewed by Chancellors and their executive leadership. Following receipt of their feedback, a final version of these recommendations will be provided to President Ross for approval.

### Performance Review of Tenured Faculty

~~[At its meeting on May 16, 1997, the Board of Governors adopted the recommendations in the report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review entitled, "Post-Tenure Review in The University of North Carolina." These recommendations are contained herein. The full text of the report is available at UNC General Administration.]~~

#### Recommendations

~~1. That~~

The Board of Governors adopts the following policy concerning performance reviews of tenured faculty.<sup>1</sup>

1. The system of post-tenure review in the University of North Carolina shall incorporate the following principles:

a. ~~a.~~—The purpose of the review shall be to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by:

(1) ~~(1)~~—Recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance; (performance that exceeds expectations);

(2) ~~(2)~~—Providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found ~~deficient~~to not meet expectations; and

(3) ~~(3)~~—For those whose performance ~~remains deficient~~continues to not meet expectations, providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions which may, in the most serious cases, include a recommendation for discharge consistent with Chapter VI of The Code of the University.

b. ~~b.~~—The system of review will encompass and acknowledge the importance and significance of annual performance reviews while providing for comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review of the performance of all faculty, whose primary professional responsibilities are teaching, research, and/or service.

c. ~~c.~~—The review procedure must provide for the evaluation over an appropriate period of time of all aspects of professional performance of faculty relative to the mission of the institution, college, and program. For each tenured faculty member, a cumulative review shall take place no less frequently than every five years. A review undertaken to grant tenure or to decide on promotion qualifies as such a cumulative review.

d. ~~d.~~—There must be peer involvement in the review.

~~e.~~

e. Both the department chair/unit head and the dean must conduct an evaluative review in the cumulative review process.

f. The provost must annually certify that all aspects of the post-tenure review process are in compliance with this policy and any associated guidelines adopted by the president

<sup>1</sup> This policy was initially adopted based on the recommendations contained in the report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review entitled, "Post-Tenure Review in The University of North Carolina." The full text of the report is available at UNC General Administration.

of the University.

~~e.g.~~ e.g. The review process must include written feedback to the faculty member being reviewed as well as a mechanism for faculty response to the evaluation.

~~f.h.~~ f. Institutional policies for post-tenure review must not abrogate, in any way, the criteria and procedures for due process and for discharge or other disciplinary action established in Chapter VI of *The Code* of the University.

~~g.i.~~ g. While constituent institutions may wish to consider individual development or career plans for all faculty as a part of the review system, each performance review system must require such a plan for each faculty member ~~receiving less than satisfactory ratings~~ who does not meet expectations in the cumulative review. These individual development or career plans must include specific steps designed to lead to improvement, a specified timeline in which improvement is expected to occur, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated timeline.

~~h.j.~~ h. In proposing its policies, each constituent institution must consider the resources necessary to support and facilitate a meaningful review system and its outcomes.

2. ~~2.~~ That within the broad principles approved in 1., above, each constituent institution will develop policies and procedures for review that will reflect the mission of the institution. Development a system of post-tenure review will require re-examination of the effectiveness of current faculty personnel policies as well as planning and program review policies.

~~3.~~ 3. That ~~institutions the president of the University will have one year following the release of~~ adopt guidelines ~~by General Administration~~ that include training and process requirements and provide for periodic audits to ~~develop their~~ ensure compliance with this policy and the guidelines.

~~3.4.~~ Each institution shall adopt and maintain policies ~~and procedures for the performance review of tenured faculty that are consistent with this policy.~~

~~4.5.~~ 4. That the policies and procedures developed by each constituent institution will be ~~approved by the Board of Governors and included~~ effective upon review and approval by the president of the University, or his or her designee, in appropriate documents of the constituent institutions ~~accordance with any regulations or guidelines adopted.~~

**Note:** “Because of the unique character and mission of the University of North Carolina School of the Arts,<sup>2</sup> the requirement that the institution adopt tenure policies will be satisfied at that institution based on renewable contracts. . .” (*The Code*). Therefore, the recommendations contained herein are not applicable to the North Carolina School of the Arts.

---

<sup>2</sup> Name changed from North Carolina School of the Arts to University of North Carolina School of the Arts effective August 1, 2008.

### **Performance Review of Tenured Faculty**

The Board of Governors adopts the following policy concerning performance reviews of tenured faculty.<sup>1</sup>

1. The system of post-tenure review in the University of North Carolina shall incorporate the following principles:
  - a. The purpose of the review shall be to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by:
    - (1) Recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance (performance that exceeds expectations);
    - (2) Providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found to not meet expectations; and
    - (3) For those whose performance continues to not meet expectations, providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions which may, in the most serious cases, include a recommendation for discharge consistent with Chapter VI of *The Code* of the University.
  - b. The system of review will encompass and acknowledge the importance and significance of annual performance reviews while providing for comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review of the performance of all faculty, whose primary professional responsibilities are teaching, research, and/or service.
  - c. The review procedure must provide for the evaluation over an appropriate period of time of all aspects of professional performance of faculty relative to the mission of the institution, college, and program. For each tenured faculty member, a cumulative review shall take place no less frequently than every five years. A review undertaken to grant tenure or to decide on promotion qualifies as such a cumulative review.
  - d. There must be peer involvement in the review.
  - e. Both the department chair/unit head and the dean must conduct an evaluative review in the cumulative review process.
  - f. The provost must annually certify that all aspects of the post-tenure review process are in compliance with this policy and any associated guidelines adopted by the president of the University.
  - g. The review process must include written feedback to the faculty member being reviewed as well as a mechanism for faculty response to the evaluation.
  - h. Institutional policies for post-tenure review must not abrogate, in any way, the criteria and procedures for due process and for discharge or other disciplinary action established in Chapter VI of *The Code* of the University.

---

<sup>1</sup> This policy was initially adopted based on the recommendations contained in the report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review entitled, "Post-Tenure Review in The University of North Carolina." The full text of the report is available at UNC General Administration.



- i. While constituent institutions may wish to consider individual development or career plans for all faculty as a part of the review system, each performance review system must require such a plan for each faculty member who does not meet expectations in the cumulative review. These individual development or career plans must include specific steps designed to lead to improvement, a specified timeline in which improvement is expected to occur, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated timeline.
  - j. In proposing its policies, each constituent institution must consider the resources necessary to support and facilitate a meaningful review system and its outcomes.
2. That within the broad principles approved in 1., above, each constituent institution will develop policies and procedures for review that will reflect the mission of the institution. Development a system of post-tenure review will require re-examination of the effectiveness of current faculty personnel policies as well as planning and program review policies.
  3. That the president of the University will adopt guidelines that include training and process requirements and provide for periodic audits to ensure compliance with this policy and the guidelines.
  4. Each institution shall adopt and maintain policies for the performance review of tenured faculty that are consistent with this policy.
  5. That the policies and procedures developed by each constituent institution will be effective upon review and approval by the president of the University, or his or her designee, in accordance with any regulations or guidelines adopted.

**Note:** “Because of the unique character and mission of the University of North Carolina School of the Arts,<sup>2</sup> the requirement that the institution adopt tenure policies will be satisfied at that institution based on renewable contracts. . .” (*The Code*). Therefore, the recommendations contained herein are not applicable to the North Carolina School of the Arts.

---

<sup>2</sup> Name changed from North Carolina School of the Arts to University of North Carolina School of the Arts effective August 1, 2008.

## Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty

### Background

At its meeting on May 16, 1997, the Board of Governors adopted the recommendations in the report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review. A copy of that report is available at General Administration. Post-tenure review is defined in the report as “a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality” (p. 8).

The report asserts that review of the performance of tenured faculty in the University shall be “to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by:

1. ~~1.~~ —Recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance;
2. ~~2.~~ —Providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found deficient; and
3. ~~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” (p. 12).

The report also provides broad principles for carrying out such reviews but leaves room for each institution to develop the details of its own process following the release of guidelines by General Administration. In keeping with Section 602 of *The Code*, the board of trustees of each constituent institution shall adopt the policies and regulations governing performance reviews of tenured faculty. Institutional policies and procedures will also be approved pursuant to Policy 400.3.3 and should be included in all appropriate documents of the constituent institutions.

The report further specifies that “developing a system of post-tenure review will require reexamination of the effectiveness of current faculty personnel policies as well as planning and program review policies” (p. 13). Initiation of these performance reviews in the University of North Carolina provides constituent institutions with an opportunity to create a policy that examines individual faculty contributions to departmental, school/college, and university goals as well as to the academic programs in which faculty teach. Thoughtful attention to the ways in which post-tenure review can promote faculty vitality across their careers will assure that such reviews lead to increased effectiveness within the university.

Guidelines to assist in formulating institutional policy concerning performance reviews of tenured faculty are set out below. ~~Guidelines adopted in June 1997 were used by constituent institutions to develop their post-tenure review policies. Revision of the These guidelines was deemed necessary because of the substantial discrepancies in post-tenure review outcomes noted among constituent institutions over a period of years. A review of constituent institution policies identified practices at some institutions that constrained the have been promulgated and are periodically reviewed to assure the continuing~~ rigorous application of post-tenure review as intended by the Board of Governors: as described in Policy 400.3.3.

### Guidelines

~~The following guidelines-~~

Each constituent institution shall be observed-observe the following guidelines in developing or revising institutional policies and procedures for post-tenure review:

1. ~~1.~~ —~~Institutions shall develop policies and procedures for implementing post-tenure review and revise them as necessary to conform with the following amended guidelines.~~ Proposed revised policies must be submitted to General Administration for approval ~~no later~~

~~than October 1, 2008. Implementation in accordance with any timeframe established and communicated by the president of revised policies will be effective upon approval pursuant to Policy 400.3.3 the University, or his or her designee.~~

~~2. Institutional policies shall assure that each tenured faculty member undergoes a cumulative review no less frequently than every five years. (Note: a review undertaken to grant tenure or to decide on promotion qualifies as such a cumulative review.)~~

~~3. Institutional policies shall assure that faculty performance will be examined relative to the mission of the institution, college, and program.~~

~~4. Institutional policies shall be in compliance with the criteria and procedures for due process and for discharge or other disciplinary action established in Chapter VI of *The Code of the University*.~~

~~2. Institutional policy statements~~

~~5. Post-tenure reviews shall evaluate all aspects of the professional performance of faculty, whose primary responsibilities are teaching, and/or research, and/or service. If faculty responsibilities are primarily only in one or two of these areas, the post-tenure review and resulting recommendations should take this allocation of responsibilities into account.~~

~~6. At the beginning of the post-tenure review cycle, the faculty member shall propose a set of directional goals on which the post-tenure review will be based. These directional goals shall be approved by the department chair. Directional goals can be modified annually by the faculty member, in consultation with the department chair, as deemed appropriate by changes in institutional, departmental, or personal circumstances. Directional goals should include milestones that will be incorporated into annual performance evaluations.~~

~~2.7. Institutional policies shall show the relationship between the annual performance review of tenured faculty and the post-tenure review criteria. Annual performance reviews, however, are not a substitute for the "comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review" required by the Board of Governors. The post-tenure review process can be informed by annual reviews but must involve an additional assessment as described in these guidelines.~~

~~3. Institutional reviews shall provide for the evaluation of all aspects of the professional performance of faculty, whose primary responsibilities are teaching, and/or research, and/or service. If faculty responsibilities are primarily only to one or two of these areas, post-tenure review and resulting recommendations should take this allocation of responsibilities into account.~~

~~3. 4. Institutional policies shall assure that faculty performance will be examined relative to the mission of the institution, college, and program.~~

~~4. 5. Institutional policies shall assure that each tenured faculty member undergoes accumulative review no less frequently than every five years. (Note: a review undertaken to grant tenure or to decide on promotion qualifies as such a cumulative review.)~~

~~5.8. 6. Institutional policies shall explicitly involve peers in the post-tenure review process. A peer review committee for a department or academic unit will be selected by a process agreed upon by the tenured faculty in that unit. The faculty member being reviewed will not have the option of selecting members of the peer review committee. The department chair or academic unit head must consult with the peer review committee. Post-tenure review outcomes in an academic unit must be reviewed at one or more higher administrative levels in rendering his or her evaluation. Deans must provide an evaluative review in addition to the review conducted by the peer review committee and the department chair. The provost must certify that all aspects of the post-tenure review process for that year are in compliance with policy and guidelines.~~

~~7. Institutional policies~~

~~9. Institutions shall provide ongoing support and training for all post-tenure review evaluators, including peer review committee members, department chairs or academic unit heads, and deans. UNC General Administration will prepare digital training modules that focus on the basics of state personnel policy and UNC policies, regulations, and guidelines related to personnel and tenure; the essential elements of a useful and thoughtful review; how to prepare, conduct and manage a meaningful review process; and how to provide constructive criticism in a positive manner. Campuses shall ensure that all post-tenure review evaluators benefit from these modules and receive training in campus-specific policies and procedures. In submitting required annual post-tenure review reports, the provost will also certify that required training has been conducted.~~

~~10. UNC General Administration will conduct training and process audits of all campuses during the 2015-2016 fiscal year. In subsequent years, UNC General Administration shall conduct process audits of all campuses on a three-year rotating cycle unless irregularities at a particular campus are identified. If such irregularities are identified, then UNC General Administration shall conduct more frequent process audits of that institution as deemed appropriate by the president or his or her designee. As part of the process audits, the president or his or her designee will certify that the constituent institution is in compliance with all aspects of the policy and guidelines.~~

~~6-11. Institutional policies shall establish three assessment categories: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, and does not meet expectations. Institutional policies also shall assure that there is written feedback to the faculty member being reviewed as well as a mechanism for the faculty response member to respond to the evaluation. As intended by the Board of Governors, this feedback should include recognition for exemplary performance- that exceeds expectations. Because performance rewards are often part of the annual review process, the post-tenure review may provide additional support for this form of recognition. A negative reviewAny review that results in an evaluation that the faculty member does not meet expectations must include a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member's assigned duties. Faculty and the directional goals established. A faculty member's response to a negative review that the faculty member does not meet expectations will also be shared at the next highest administrative level.~~

~~7. 8. Institutional policies shall be in compliance with the criteria and procedures for due process and for discharge or other disciplinary action established in Chapter VI of The Code of the University.~~

~~8-12. 9. Institutional policies shall require individual development or career plans for all faculty receiving less than satisfactory ratingsmembers who do not meet expectations in the cumulative review. These plans must include specific steps designed to lead to improvement, a specified timeline in which improvement is expected to occur, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated timeline. The use of mentoring peers is encouraged, and progress meetings with the department chair or academic unit head must occur on at least a semi-annual basis during the specified timeline. If duties are modified as a result of a less than satisfactory ratingan assessment that the faculty member does not meet expectations, then the development or career plan should so indicate and take into account the new allocation of responsibilities.~~

~~10. As policies are developed and revised, institutions shall consider resource implications of a meaningful performance review system, identifying in advance the sources of support for the process and its outcomes.~~

~~Implementation of revised institutional policies will be effective upon approval as provided in Policy 400.3.3.~~