Regulation on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)

I. Purpose. This Regulation is designed to assist constituent institutions in formulating policies and procedures concerning performance reviews of tenured faculty, and ensuring those policies and procedures are both promulgated and periodically reviewed to continue the rigorous application of post-tenure review as intended by the Board of Governors in UNC Policy 400.3.3.

II. Development and Approval of Institutional Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Policies and Procedures. In addition to the parameters set forth in UNC Policy 400.3.3, each constituent institution shall observe the following in developing or revising institutional policies and procedures for post-tenure review:

A. PTR policies and procedures shall be developed by the chief academic officer, however titled, or designee, in consultation with the representative body of the institution's faculty.

B. PTR policies and procedures shall examine faculty performance relative to the mission of the institution, college, and department/program, and consistent with chapter six of *The Code*.

C. PTR policies shall be approved by the constituent institution's board of trustees.

II. Post-Tenure Scope and Review Categories:

A. Post-tenure reviews shall evaluate all aspects of the professional performance of tenured faculty members, whose primary responsibilities are teaching, research/creative activity, and service.

1. Post-tenure review and resulting recommendations shall take the allocation of a faculty member's responsibilities into account.

2. If a faculty member is reassigned to other duties (e.g., department chair or head) for .50 FTE or more, or is occupying a leave-earning position (e.g., SAAO Tier I or Tier II), that faculty member shall not be required to undergo post-tenure review until having completed a five-year cycle following the reassignment.

B. Institutional post-tenure review policies and procedures shall utilize the three assessment categories defined in UNC Policy 400.3.3: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, and does not meet expectations. Each academic unit shall expand upon these definitions and publish transparent, specific standards that determine each category as they relate to the faculty member's teaching, research/creative activity, and service (as applicable), subject to approval by the dean and the chief academic officer, however titled.

III. Post-Tenure Review Processes: Institutional post-tenure review policies and procedures shall require the following:

A. Institutions shall utilize the training provided by the UNC System for all post-tenure review evaluators, including peer review committee members, department chairs/academic unit heads, and deans.

B. At the beginning of the post-tenure review cycle, the faculty member and the department chair/academic unit head shall develop a five-year comprehensive work plan. That plan shall be coordinated with the annual work plans and evaluations required by UNC Policy 400.3.4, *Policy on Faculty Workload*, although annual evaluations are not a substitute for the comprehensive, periodic, cumulative performance (post-tenure) review required by the Board of Governors.

    1. Institutional policies and procedures shall allow faculty members, in consultation with the department chair/academic unit head, to modify the five-year-plan annually, as deemed appropriate by changes in institutional, departmental, or personal circumstances.

    2. Institutional policies and procedures shall address how any faculty plans resulting from an annual evaluation shall be considered in the post-tenure review process.

C. A self-assessment component shall be part of the post-tenure review processes. This component shall provide faculty members the opportunity to offer the review committee an important perspective. Each institution shall design and define the specifics on length, format, and required information for these self-assessments.

D. A peer review committee for a department/academic unit shall be selected by a process agreed upon by the tenured faculty in that unit, in accordance with the following guidelines:

    1. The faculty member being reviewed shall not have the option of selecting members of the peer review committee.

    2. If the institution's department includes no other expert in the specific field of research/creative activity of the faculty member under review, institutions may establish a process for requesting external faculty experts to provide a review of the candidate's work (e.g., research and publications). The external expert shall be a tenured faculty member and, if available, from a UNC constituent institution.

E. The peer review committee shall provide a brief, written rationale for each assessment in each relevant category (teaching, research/creative activity, service).

    1. Any performance review that includes recognition for performance that exceeds expectations in any category shall include a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of how the faculty member exceeded assigned duties and the directional goals established.

    2. Any performance review that indicates the faculty member does not meet expectations in any category shall 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 and the directional goals established.

F. The department chair/academic unit head must consult with the peer review committee before rendering the chair's required evaluation.

G. The department chair/academic unit head shall provide a separate, written evaluation of the faculty member. That evaluation shall explicitly state points of concurrence or points of variation from the review committee. Any recommendation for a faculty success plan or for recognition of performance that exceeds expectations shall be accompanied by a specific rationale for that recommendation.

H. Before the reviews of the peer committee and the department chair proceed to the dean, the faculty member shall have no less than fourteen (14) calendar days from receiving these documents to provide a written response.

I. The appropriate dean shall provide a written evaluative review based on the reports of the peer review committee, the department chair, and any written response from the faculty member.

    1. A faculty member whose review results in an overall rating of exceeding expectations shall be considered to have completed the post-tenure review process. Institutions shall create a process to forward recommendations regarding a faculty member exceeding expectations to the chief academic officer, however titled, for recognition and reward and to indicate what types of recognition and reward are available and how such is determined.

    2. A faculty member whose review results in meeting expectations shall be considered to have completed the post-tenure review process.

    3. A faculty member whose review results in does not meet expectations in any area shall be subject to a faculty success plan.

J. Faculty success plans shall be formative and include specific steps designed to lead to improvement. Institutions shall specify timelines, of at least two academic terms and perhaps longer depending on the area in which improvement is required. The faculty success plan must include a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated timeline.

    1. Peer mentoring is encouraged as part of the faculty success plans.

    2. Progress meetings with the department chair/academic unit head shall occur on at least a semi-annual basis during the specified timeline.

    3. The department chair/academic unit head, in consultation with the dean, may redefine faculty workloads and distribution of teaching, research/creative activity, and service in cases where a faculty member receives a does not meet expectations post-tenure review assessment.

        a. The chair/head and dean shall ensure any changes to these duties are not punitive responses to the faculty member and instead address ways to support the department, school/college, and institution to better leverage the faculty member's expertise and abilities and improve their performance in any areas deemed deficient.

b. The faculty success plan shall detail the changes in duties and responsibilities, and the faculty member's annual performance review must take into consideration any mid-cycle changes to the duties during the reporting period (e.g., the faculty member should not receive negative marks on the annual review for a failure to complete duties/responsibilities after the date of the removal).

K. The department chairs/academic unit heads, through their deans, shall certify compliance with all aspects of the post- tenure review process and with UNC policy and guidelines to the chief academic officer, however titled. The chief academic officers, in turn, shall note the institution's compliance in an annual report on post-tenure review to the UNC System Office.

IV. The UNC System Office shall review the post-tenure review processes of all institutions on a three-year rotating cycle, unless irregularities at a particular institution are identified.

A. If/when such irregularities are identified, then the UNC System Office shall conduct more frequent reviews of that institution, as deemed appropriate by the president or designee.

B. As part of this review, the president or designee shall certify that the constituent institution is in compliance with all aspects of the policy and guidelines.