

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT ASHEVILLE

FACULTY SENATE

Senate Document Number 0709F

Date of Senate Approval 10/08/09

Statement of Faculty Senate Action:

FWDC 1: Revision to Post Tenure Review (revision of SD0208F, Faculty Handbook 3.7)

Effective Date: Fall 2010

Rationale: General Administration has reviewed the revision to PTR that was approved by Faculty Senate last Fall (SD0208F), and decided this was a good policy, but the GA had three issues (quoted from a letter dated May 13, 2009)

- 1) "The Policy envisions the Provost conducting the evaluations in conjunction with a university-wide peer committee, while UNC policies envision the department chair or unit head working in conjunction with a departmental peer committee in performing these reviews"
- 2) "... because you, as Provost, are making the final decisions, there is no higher authority to provide a review of your work"
- 3) "The Policy does not adequately describe the contents of a negative report, nor does it fully describe the contents of a development plan".

We have made a series of amendments to 3.7 (Post-tenure review), in an attempt to accommodate the requests of GA. Item 1 is to be addressed in a letter from the Provost to GA detailing how our mission requires evaluation by a multidisciplinary committee.

UNC Asheville's PTR is intended as a formative process, with a report generated by PTRC, and a recommendation made from PTRC to the Program area Dean, who conveys this recommendation to the candidate. This makes the Provost available as the route of appeal.

Summary of changes:

3.7.1 PTR is redefined as a "process" rather than procedure, and some names are amended to match the current administrative structure.

3.7.2 The Office of the Provost is the source of supporting documents. The asterisk is removed in the "Failure of the evaluatee to provide materials section", because the statement is not a referenced footnote.

3.7.3.

1. Guidelines are added for the PTRC's report
2. The section is deleted – provisions for challenges are detailed in the next section
3. (now 2) The PTRC makes a recommendation to the Program area Dean, who writes a letter to the candidate affirming the recommendation. It is worth noting that in the original document, the PTRC is given the charge to make a recommendation to the Provost, so no additional duties have been added to the PTRC

A. "Report" is changed to "recommendation", the ordering of the sentences is changed so that the final sentence is "The PTR process will then be complete". The last sentence of the original has been deleted, as it contains references to old programs.

B. The recommendation is sent from the Dean to the Candidate, who may then challenge it by petitioning the Provost. The recommendation specifies which of the three target areas of teaching, scholarship and service are of concern. If the Provost affirms the report, then the candidate draws up an evaluation plan, which contains specific steps to address the recommendation – it is the evaluation plan which is summative.

4. (now 3) grammar and titles amended

5. (now 4) Report capitalized.

Faculty Handbook section 3.7 showing changes

Additions due to this document are given in [square brackets]

Deletions due to this document are represented as ~~double strikethrough~~

3.7 Post-tenure review (SD1000F) (SD6405S) (SD0208F) (planned as 3.12 and subsections in Senate document)

Post-Tenure review at UNC Asheville is a periodic, comprehensive, cumulative review of tenured members of the faculty that emphasizes peer participation. The primary purpose of Post-Tenure Review (PTR) is to ensure continued faculty development and promote faculty vitality.

3.7.1 Objectives of Post-Tenure Review

Entirely separate from reviews for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, PTR is a formative process that focuses on identifying specific areas of strength among senior faculty and, when appropriate, areas requiring more concentrated development efforts. PTR recognizes and respects disciplinary differences in pedagogy and in the focus of faculty professional activities. This ~~procedure~~ [process] recognizes that each faculty member is reviewed annually by the department chair and that this review is a comprehensive evaluation [in the three major areas] of teaching, scholarship, and service. The PTR creates a summary of several years of professional activity that may address trends not immediately obvious in an annual comprehensive review and annual faculty record. As professionals, faculty will welcome opportunities for and are committed to professional growth. The faculty assume primary responsibility for the

implementation of activities which foster professional growth in ways that support the missions of their programs and the University as well as their own professional career(s). Professional development plans (see [Section 3.7.3](#) below) will identify resource support necessary to accomplish specified goals. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs (hereafter referred to as Provost) is responsible for approval of these plans and allocation of any special resource support required to accomplish the objectives of the plan(s).

3.7.2 Procedure for Evaluation

For the purpose of these sections, the words "Department Chair" and "Chair" (except where Post Tenure Review Committee Chair is noted) refers to any faculty member who directly evaluates the PTR evaluatee for merit, reappointment, tenure or promotion.

1. The term "faculty member" includes all persons on a nine or twelve-month contract who teach one half or more of a full load and librarians with faculty rank. A faculty member who accepts an administrative appointment which results in teaching less than one half of a full load will have their PTR review period extended by the time served in this appointment.
2. After an initial phase-in period, tenured faculty members shall be evaluated every five years. During this phase-in period, faculty who have gone the longest since their last review for tenure or promotion will be evaluated first. The Provost may approve the postponement of Post-Tenure Review in a case of illness, leave of absence, family emergency or other similar circumstances.
3. A review for promotion will take precedence over the PTR process and may replace it as follows. When faculty members apply for promotion in the same year they are to be evaluated for PTR, the PTR will be postponed. If successful, the review for promotion will satisfy the requirement for PTR and will start a new five-year PTR clock for the faculty member who is promoted. If the review for promotion is not successful, however, the faculty member will complete the PTR process in the following year, even if the application for promotion is renewed. Thus, post-tenure reviews will be deferred by an application for promotion only once.

4. In the ~~Spring~~ [spring] before the academic year in which a tenured faculty member is to be evaluated, the [Office of the] Provost begins the evaluation process by notifying the selected tenured faculty members and requesting them to begin assembling materials for the review committee. In this process, the [Office of the] Provost serves as facilitator and convener.

5. The evaluation will be performed by a University-wide committee called the Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC).

6. Evaluation of tenured faculty members is peer evaluation. The committee will consider a variety of materials. Peer observation of teaching will always be one of the procedures employed in the evaluation.

7. The PTRC will review a dossier containing documents from several sources. The evaluatee will submit the items noted (see A 1-4, below) to the Chair of his or her department. The Chair will provide items 5 and 6. [The Office of Institutional Research will provide item 7.] For evaluation of Chairs, the most senior tenured member of the department/program will normally assume the duties of the Chair, as described below.

A. Completed Dossier

The evaluatee's dossier is assembled by the Chair (or, for evaluation of Chairs, by the most senior tenured member of the department) and submitted to the PTRC. The complete dossier will include, in order:

- 1) The Evaluatee's Statement focusing on the five years of the PTR review period (submitted by Evaluatee to Chair)
- 2) The Professional Curriculum Vitae (submitted by Evaluatee to Chair)
- 3) Chair's Evaluation (prepared by the Chair, or for the review of Chairs, by the most senior tenured member of the department)
- 4) Results from Peer Observation of Classroom Teaching (prepared by the Chair)
- 5) Annual Faculty Records (past five years, collected by [the Office of the] Provost and submitted to the Chair)
- 6) Merit Evaluations (past five years, collected by [the Office of the] Provost and

submitted to the Chair)

7) Summary of numbers from course evaluations over the past five years (provided by Office of Institutional Research to the Chair). Written student comments may be requested by the PTRC and will be made available.

≠Failure of the evaluatee to provide materials for his or her dossier in a timely fashion may result in sanctions imposed by the Provost.

B. The Evaluatee's Statement

1) Purpose: The Evaluatee's Statement should be a reflective, self-assessment that comments on the evaluatee's past, present and future contributions to the department, the university and their missions. This statement may also be used to discuss factors and extenuating circumstances affecting the evaluatee's performance, which are not usually covered in the listing of activities by category. The evaluatee should refer to categories outlined in [Section 3.5.4.3](#) of the Faculty Handbook.

2) Format: The Evaluatee's Statement should be written as a cover letter to the Chair of the PTRC. The statement is written in narrative form; possible issues to address, along with categories and guidelines for evaluating performance, are discussed in [Section 3.5.4.3](#). The Evaluatee should also outline briefly, his or her professional plans for the next five years, again, in the context of the department and university mission, which may also include a discussion of resources required.

C. The Professional Curriculum Vitae

1) Purpose: The complete curriculum vitae puts the evaluatee's professional work at UNCA into perspective relative to the individual's career in general. This allows the PTRC to evaluate the individual's recent activities or changing emphases at UNCA in light of his or her previous levels of activity and responsibilities.

2) Format: The vita should be written in a format appropriate to apply for an academic position in the discipline. It should include information about the evaluatee's education, degrees, awards, honors, professional employment and most important,

papers/publications/artistic activities, grant activities, professional consultancies and major service activities.

D. Materials supporting professional activity (submitted by evaluatee to Department Chair, if requested)

1) Purpose: Materials selected by the evaluatee are meant to emphasize or augment the vita regarding teaching, scholarly and service activities. Materials provided should be chosen to illuminate the quality of the evaluatee's activities rather than duplicate those reported in the vita.

2) Format: Materials provided by the evaluatee should be representative and only a sampling, supporting:

a) Teaching: Representative syllabi, assignments, student work or other materials illustrating teaching practices and student learning.

b) Scholarship/Creative Activity: Representative scholarly papers, letters of commendation, awards, reviews of scholarly, creative or performance activities.

c) Service: Representative professional service activities to local or greater community, letters of commendation, awards, etc.

E. Results of Peer Observation of Teaching (provided by the Chair of the department and assembled in the dossier submitted to the PTRC)

1) Purpose: Evaluations of teaching by peer observation supplement other measures of effective teaching.

2) Format: Each peer observer should submit a ~~one to two~~ [one-to-two] page written summary of his or her observations to the faculty member, and the Chair of the evaluatee's department. Reports must include specific comments on the dimensions cited above.

F. Chair's Evaluation (provided by the Chair of the department and assembled in the dossier submitted to the PTRC)

1) Purpose: The Chair's Evaluation has always been central to decisions concerning reappointment, tenure and promotion. It is a summary evaluation that, when viewed together with the evaluations appended to the Faculty record, provides an historical account of the evaluatee's overall performance as viewed by the Chair.

2) Format: The Chair's Evaluation should be written in simple narrative form, to the Chair of the PTRC, addressing the evaluatee's past, present and future contributions to the department, the university and their missions. This statement may also be used to address factors and extenuating circumstances affecting the evaluatee's performance, which are not usually covered in the listing of activities by category. The Chair must consult with faculty colleagues and report on that consultation (as is the case for reappointment, tenure and promotion reviews, see [Section 3.5.4.4](#)). For purposes of faculty development, the Chair should discuss the evaluation with the faculty member, prior to submission of the evaluation to the PTRC.

8. The faculty member and his or her chair will provide all materials to the Office of Academic Affairs by December 1.

9. For Post-Tenure Review of Chairs, the most senior tenured member of the department will normally assume the duties of the Chair. However, a Chair who perceives a conflict of interest with that person may petition the Provost to appoint another tenured faculty member to those responsibilities. If no tenured member is available within the department, the Provost may appoint one from a department within the same division of the university, giving weight to seniority of UNCA service and consulting with the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Development.

3.7.3 Results of Post-Tenure Review

1. The PTRC will write a report [following the objectives of PTR given in section 3.7.1] that will go to the faculty member, the department chair, and the Provost [Program Area Dean to] ~~The report will~~ be submitted by March 1.

~~2. The evaluatee has the right to challenge any of the contents of the PTRC's report by submitting, to the Provost, any further evidence, mitigating or complicating~~

~~circumstances, etc. This must be in a letter received in the Provost's office within fourteen calendar days of the submission of the PTRC's report. The Provost will respond within twenty-one calendar days of receiving the challenge letter.~~

~~3.~~ 2. The PTRC is advisory to the Provost and like the committee for tenure review [will make a recommendation] ~~makes recommendations~~ directly to the Provost [Program area Dean]. ~~During initial review of an evaluatee, the PTRC makes one of two recommendations~~ [Drawing on the contents of the report, the Program Area Dean conveys the recommendation of the PTRC to the candidate. The recommendation will be one of the following]

A. The faculty member has performed at a Successful level. ~~The Post-Tenure Review process will then be complete. The PTR Committee Report~~ [recommendation] will be sent to the faculty member, with copies to the Chair and the Provost. The ~~Report~~ [recommendation] will express collegial appreciation for contributions to the mission of UNC Asheville, and will take note of any performances, accomplishments or contributions that appear excellent or exemplary. ~~The Report may express support for the provision of university resources such as a Teaching Scholarship Year, or an Off-Campus Scholarly Assignment when the faculty member has shown that this will benefit future excellence. [The Post-Tenure Review process will then be complete.]~~

B. The evaluatee has one or more areas that require concentrated development efforts. ~~The PTR Committee advisory report dossier~~ [recommendation] will be sent to the Provost for further review and final decision, with copies to the evaluatee and the Chair. The Report will identify ~~the area or areas~~ [which of the three major areas of teaching, scholarship and/or service are] of concern while noting any performances or accomplishments that appear commendable or excellent. The faculty member may challenge the ~~advisory report~~ [recommendation by petitioning in writing to the Provost within 14 calendar days of receiving the recommendation] ~~as provided above.~~

If the Provost affirms the ~~Report~~ [recommendation] after considering a challenge, or ~~affirms an unchallenged report~~ [the recommendation is unchallenged], the faculty member will construct a Development Plan in consultation with the Chair and the ~~Associate Vice Chancellor~~ [Program Area Dean] ~~assigned as liaison to the PTR~~

~~process~~. The Plan will [both] address [which of the three major areas of teaching, scholarship and service] ~~the area or areas that~~ warrant improvement [,and include specific steps to lead to that improvement]. The Plan will include a time when the evaluatee will again be reviewed by the PTRC - no less than one year later, up to three years later. The Chair and the Provost will review the plan to determine resource implications. The Plan must be approved by the Provost. The evaluatee will meet at least semi-annually with the Department chair or academic unit head during the development period to assess progress.

Development Plans should include provision for mentoring peers who are requested by the Evaluatee and approved by the Provost. Mentoring peers should be senior members of the faculty who are skillful in collegial relationships and recognized for excellence in the area(s) requiring improvement. On request a mentoring peer may be appointed before the Development Plan is finalized.

~~4~~ 3. At the conclusion of the term specified in the development plan the evaluatee will be reviewed a second time by the PTRC. The committee will review the original file, the development plan, and a new file documenting developmental progress. In all of the following contingency proceedings, the PTR Advisory Report will be sent to the Provost for review and final decision, with copies to the evaluatee and the chair. The PTRC now can make one of three recommendations to the Provost:

A. The evaluatee is performing at a Successful Level. The advisory Report will recognize developmental progress and take note of any added accomplishments, performances or contributions to the mission of UNCA which are commendable or excellent.

B. The evaluatee has made some progress toward remediating problem areas but should continue his/her efforts.

C. The evaluatee has failed to make any progress toward improvement and warrants sanctions. In a case that warrants sanctions the Provost will decide the nature of these sanctions. Before implementing [sanctions] ~~these~~ the Provost should consult with the PTRC, much as the Provost now consults with the Committee of Tenured Faculty

before issuing a denial of tenure, but the final decision, as with tenure, is up to the Provost.

If the Provost affirms a PTRC Report that recommends continued development work, the evaluatee will revise the plan in consultation with his/her Chair and the ~~Associate Vice Chancellor assigned as liaison to the PTR process~~ [Program Area Dean] and come before the PTRC one final time in 1-2 years.

~~5.~~ 4. If a final review is warranted, the PTRC now can make only one of two recommendations:

A. The PTRC advises that the evaluatee is performing at a Successful Level. The ~~report~~ [Report] will acknowledge developmental progress and take note of any new performances, accomplishments or contributions to the mission of UNCA that appear excellent or commendable.

B. The PTRC advises that the evaluatee has failed to make sufficient progress toward improvement and warrants sanctions.

~~6.~~ 5. Any sanctions including discharge or other disciplinary action imposed on faculty members for continuing deficiency in performance shall be in compliance with the criteria and procedures for due process as established in Chapter VI, Sections 602, 603, and 605 of The Code of the University of North Carolina.