



REPORT: PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

May 18, 2017

University of North Carolina General Administration
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Introduction

Since 1998-99, the Division of Academic Affairs has collected campus data on the outcomes of post-tenure review of faculty.¹ The policy and guidelines for Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, or post-tenure review, were adopted by the University of North Carolina's Board of Governors (BOG) in 1997 and strengthened in 2014.² The 2014 update included guidelines that "...assure the continuing rigorous application of post-tenure review as intended by the Board of Governors." The policy states that it 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; and
3. Including a recommendation for discharge, in the most serious cases, for those whose performance remains unsatisfactory, providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions.

The University of North Carolina (UNC) institutions 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; and
4. Require individual development or career plans for each faculty member receiving less than satisfactory ratings in the cumulative review, including specific steps designed for improvement, a specified timeline for development, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time line.

The recently amended policies and guidelines require time to implement and report. 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.

1 UNC School of the Arts and NC School of Science and Mathematics do not award tenure.

2 Sections 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1 [G] of the UNC Policy manual.

Outcomes of Performance Reviews

As part of the eighteenth year in which reviews have been conducted, information for 2015-16 post-tenure review activities was collected from UNC institutions. Across institutions, tenured faculty accounted for approximately 35% of all faculty and those eligible for post-tenure reviews (tenured faculty with more than five years of tenure) accounted for approximately 20% of all faculty.

As summarized in Table 1, 772 tenured faculty members across the system were reviewed in 2015-16, 21 (2.7%) 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 institutions 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 across the institution every fifth year. This is in contrast to other institutions that choose to review a subset of tenured faculty every year.

Table 1. Ten-Year Post-Tenure Review Trends, 2006-07 to 2015-16

Year	# Faculty Reviewed	# of Faculty Found Unsatisfactory	% Found Unsatisfactory
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%
2014-15	715	16	2.2%
2015-16	772	21	2.7%
10-Year Total	8,239	234	2.8%

Source: Survey of tenure-granting UNC institutions, March 2017

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 is currently being implemented with 2016-17 results for the 2016-17 available next year, the review categories will be, “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: 2006-07 to 2015-16

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Total Faculty Found Unsatisfactory
ASU	4	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	-	19
ECU	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	16	-	-	20
ECSU	2	2	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	7
FSU	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	4
NC A&T	5	2	3	-	2	2	-	3	3	-	20
NCCU	-	2	3	6	1	1	1	2	-	2	18
NCSU	1	6	6	2	5	7	7	4	2	5	45
UNCA	2	1	-	3	1	-	2	1	2	2	14
UNC-CH	4	3	3	5	4	13	7	5	4	8	56
UNCC	3	1	-	1	-	-	3	1	2	-	11
UNCG	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3
UNCP	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	4
UNCW	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	3
WCU	1	1	1	-	1	2	-	-	1	2	9
WSSU	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
TOTAL	22	21	22	22	18	30	24	38	16	21	234

Source: Survey of tenure-granting UNC institutions, March 2017

For the 2015-16 post-tenure review cycle, the majority of faculty reviewed were tenured professors (56.6%), with tenured associate professors (41.8%), tenured assistant professors (0.5%), and tenured librarians (1.0%) also being reviewed. Twenty-one faculty (2.7%) were deemed “unsatisfactory” by teams of peer reviewers, which is a slightly higher percentage than the previous year. Post-tenure reviews were overwhelmingly positive with 64.6% of faculty receiving satisfactory performance reviews, 11.9% deemed above average, and 20.7% given superior performance reviews. See Appendix B for more details.

If a faculty member receives an “unsatisfactory” review, she or he 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 institution, typically ranging between one to three years. Nearly all of the faculty given “unsatisfactory” reviews in 2015-16 received this designation for the first time and they have begun working with their departments on mandatory development plans as detailed in each institutions’ policies and procedures related to section 400.3.3 of the UNC Policy manual.

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 2015-16, 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 section 400.3.3.1[G] of the UNC Policy manual 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. For example, in 2015-16, only 54 (0.8%) of the 6,329 faculty eligible for post-tenure review held the rank of assistant professor.⁴
- Second, a review undertaken to decide promotion to a higher rank is considered a cumulative, post-tenure review under UNC Guideline 400.3.3.1[G]. Thus, when tenured assistant professors choose to apply for a promotion to the rank of associate professor, they have satisfied the requirement of a post-tenure review every five years and are not counted as having undergone a post-tenure review for the purposes of this report.⁵

4 Of these 54 assistant professors, four were reviewed during this post-tenure review cycle.

5 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 Policies⁶

Campus	Link
Appalachian State University	http://facultyhandbook.appstate.edu/
East Carolina University	http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/customcf/currentfacultymanual/part9section2.pdf
Elizabeth City State University	http://www.ecsu.edu/administration/legal/docs/policymanual.pdf
Fayetteville State University	http://www.uncfsu.edu/documents/policy/employment/Post-Tenure_Review_Rev1.pdf
NC A&T	http://www.ncat.edu/provost/docs/Post-Tenure%20Review%20-%20Amended-Fall%202009.pdf
North Carolina Central University	http://www.nccu.edu/formsdocs/proxy.cfm?file_id=3354
NC State	https://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-05-20-04/
UNC Asheville	http://www3.unca.edu/aa/handbook/3.htm#3.7
UNC-Chapel Hill	https://provost.unc.edu/files/2016/08/UNC-CH-Post-Tenure-Review-Policy-Revision-Approved-2016MarBOT-Final-082416.pdf
UNC Charlotte	http://legal.uncc.edu/policies/up-102.14
UNC Greensboro	http://provost.uncg.edu/documents/personnel/posttenurereview.pdf
UNC Pembroke	http://www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/faculty-handbook
UNC Wilmington	http://uncw.edu/aa/Policies_Reports/PTRPolicyfromFacSenHandbookJan2016.pdf
Western Carolina University	http://www.wcu.edu/WebFiles/PDFs/FacultyHandbook_2016_2017.pdf#4.08
Winston-Salem State University	http://www.wssu.edu/administration/office-of-the-provost/academic-and-administrative-units/faculty-affairs/documents/faculty-handbook-3-15.pdf

⁶ UNC School of the Arts and NC School of Science and Mathematics do not award tenure.

Appendix B

2015-16 Post-Tenure Review Information by Institution

	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNC-CH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	TOTAL
1. # of PTR conducted																
Tenured Professor	26	-	6	4	11	13	117	13	138	36	20	9	21	17	6	437
Tenured Associate Professor	13	-	1	8	21	17	64	7	67	38	30	7	19	25	6	323
Tenured Assistant Professor	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	4
Tenured Professional Librarians	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	4	1	-	-	-	8
Total reviewed	39	0	7	12	33	32	181	20	205	77	55	17	40	42	12	772
2. Outcome																
Unsatisfactory	-	-	-	-	-	2	5	2	8	-	-	1	-	2	1	21
Satisfactory	21	-	2	5	20	16	176	18	57	63	30	16	24	40	11	499
Above Average	3	*	2	*	*	8	*	*	38	14	25	-	2	-	-	92
Superior	15	-	3	7	13	6	*	*	102	*	*	*	14	-	-	160
Total	39	0	7	12	33	32	181	20	205	77	55	17	40	42	12	772
3. Unsatisfactory Faculty																
Unsatisfactory for the first time	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	1	7	-	-	1	-	2	1	17
Unsatisfactory for the second time or more	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Total	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	8	0	0	1	0	2	0	21

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

Source: Survey of tenure-granting UNC institutions, March 2017

Appendix C

Faculty Found “Unsatisfactory” in 2014-15

This chart reports on the ongoing progress of faculty deemed “unsatisfactory” during the 2014-15 post-tenure review process.

	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NC A&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNC-CH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	TOTAL
# found unsatisfactory	1	-	-	-	3	-	2	2	4	2	-	-	1	1	-	16
# of unsatisfactory faculty members who:																
i. Reviewed again & deemed “satisfactory”	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	3
ii. Continue to work under mandatory development plan	1	-	-	-	3	-	1	2	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	11
iii. Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
iv. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	2

Source: Survey of tenure-granting UNC institutions, March 2017