

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT ASHEVILLE  
FACULTY SENATE

Senate Document Number 1914F  
Date of Senate Approval 12/04/14

-----  
Statement of Faculty Senate Action:

**FWDC 7:                   Revisions to Post Tenure Review ([Faculty Handbook section 3.7](#))  
and Development of Long-Term Faculty Plans**

**Effective date:** Fall 2015

**Summary:** This document makes changes to post-tenure review procedures at UNC Asheville mandated by revisions in system policy:

- a) Institutes the development of five-year plans for each member of the faculty beginning their post-tenure review period, which begins with the successful award of tenure, promotion to the rank of Professor, or successful post-tenure review;
- b) Mandates training for all post-tenure review evaluators; and
- c) Established three categories for results of post-tenure review.
- d) Connects long-term faculty plans to annual goals articulated in the annual review process.

**Rationale:** In June 2014, the UNC Board of Governors amended Policy 400.3.3, "Performance Review of Tenured Faculty," in several significant ways. In response, the General Administration developed guidelines for implementation, described in Policy 400.3.3.1[G]. The changes to post-tenure review noted above are the items we are mandated to change in order to be in compliance with these directives.

While there are no guidelines for how five-year plans are to be used, this document stipulates that there should be a connection between these long-term plans and the annual goals articulated in the annual faculty record for the upcoming academic year. The five-year plan should not be a basis for evaluation of a candidate for post-tenure review, but it should inform the annual goals and accomplishments of faculty members during the post-tenure review period.

**I. Revise section 3.4.1 as follows:**

**3.4 Annual Evaluation of Faculty**

**3.4.1 Purpose ([SD3404S](#))**

All full-time faculty members participate in an annual evaluation that has both formative and summative functions. Department chairs provide feedback on each faculty member's accomplishments, rate each individual on teaching, scholarship and scholarly or creative activity, and service and make recommendations regarding salary increases (i.e., merit raises, salary equity adjustments). Annual evaluations are reviewed by the Program Area Dean who makes the final evaluation and salary recommendation. For Department Chairs, Program Area Deans make recommendations to the Provost, who makes the final evaluation and salary recommendation. These annual evaluations become part of each faculty member's personnel file and are considered in all personnel reviews. If applicable, the annual goals should correspond to annual milestones and other elements of the five-year plans developed by tenured faculty members.

## II. Add item 13 to section 3.5.4.1 as follows:

13. A candidate for tenure and/or promotion who is awarded promotion should then, in consultation with the immediate supervisor (Department Chair, unless the candidate is a Department Chair, in which case the program area Dean), develop a five-year plan for future accomplishments. This plan should indicate milestones connected to annual goals, and may be modified annually in consultation with the immediate supervisor.

## III. Revise section 3.7 as follows:

### 3.7.2 Procedure for Evaluation

-----

5. The evaluation will be performed by a University-wide committee called the Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC). All members of the PTRC, all Chairs (and those assuming the role of Chair as described in item 9 below), and all Deans are required to complete training using (1) digital training modules developed by UNC General Administration and (2) annual information and review sessions covering campus-specific policies and procedures.

-----

### 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 Program Area Dean by March 1, with a copy to the faculty member, the department chair, and the Provost and VCAA. This report should provide a narrative evaluation of the faculty member's performance over the past five years and will include the specific recommendation of the PTRC to the Dean that the faculty member has met or exceeded expectations or has one or more areas that require concentrated development efforts.

2. Drawing on this recommendation, the Dean will evaluate the faculty member's performance as either:

A. The faculty member *exceeds expectations*. A letter communicating this evaluation will be sent to the faculty member, with copies to the Chair and the Provost. The letter will express collegial appreciation for contributions to the mission of UNC Asheville, and will cite accomplishments that are particularly noteworthy. In consultation with the immediate supervisor (Department Chair, unless the candidate is a Department Chair, in which case the program area Dean), the successful candidate should then develop a five-year plan for future accomplishments. This plan should indicate milestones connected to annual goals, and may be modified annually in consultation with the immediate supervisor. The Post-Tenure Review process will then be complete.

B. The faculty member *meets expectations*. A letter communicating this evaluation will be sent to the faculty member, with copies to the Chair and the Provost. The letter will express collegial appreciation for contributions to the mission of UNC Asheville, and will cite accomplishments that are particularly noteworthy as well as any suggested areas of improvement. In consultation with the immediate supervisor (Department Chair, unless the candidate is a Department Chair, in which case the program area Dean), the successful candidate should then develop a five-year plan for future accomplishments. This plan should indicate milestones connected to annual goals, and may be modified annually in consultation with the immediate supervisor. The Post-Tenure Review process will then be complete.

C. The evaluatee *does not meet expectations* in one or more areas that require concentrated development efforts. The letter communicating this evaluation will be sent to the evaluatee and the Chair with a copy to the Provost. The letter will identify which of the three major areas of teaching, scholarship and scholarly or creative activity, and/or service are of concern while noting any accomplishments that appear commendable or excellent. The faculty member may challenge the evaluation that a Development Plan is needed by petitioning in writing to the Provost within 14 calendar days of receiving the recommendation.

If the Provost affirms the recommendation after considering a challenge, or the recommendation is unchallenged, the faculty member will construct a Development Plan in consultation with the Chair and the Program Area Dean. The Plan will include specific steps to lead to improvement in the area(s) of concern noted in the evaluation. 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.

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 Program Area dean, the evaluatee and the chair. The PTRC now can make one of three recommendations to the Provost:

A. The evaluatee now meets or exceeds expectations. The advisory Report will recognize developmental progress and take note of any added accomplishments, which are commendable or excellent. In consultation with the immediate supervisor (Department Chair, unless the candidate is a Department Chair, in which case the program area Dean), the successful candidate should then develop a five-year plan for future accomplishments. This plan should indicate milestones connected to annual goals, and may be modified annually in consultation with the immediate supervisor. The Post-Tenure Review process will then be complete.

B. The evaluatee has made some progress toward remediating problem areas but should continue his/her efforts. If the Provost affirms this judgment, the evaluatee will revise the plan in consultation with his/her Chair and the Program Area Dean and come before the PTRC one final time in 1-2 years. 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 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.

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

A. The PTRC advises that the evaluatee now meets or exceeds expectations. The Report will acknowledge developmental progress and take note of any new accomplishments or contributions to the mission of UNC Asheville that appear excellent or commendable. In consultation with the immediate supervisor (Department Chair, unless the candidate is a Department Chair, in which case the program area Dean), the successful candidate should then develop a five-year plan for future accomplishments. This plan should indicate milestones connected to annual goals, and may be modified annually in consultation with the immediate supervisor. The Post-Tenure Review process will then be complete.

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

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.