

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT ASHEVILLE  
FACULTY SENATE

Senate Document Number 7516S  
Date of Senate Approval 03/17/16

-----  
Statement of Faculty Senate Action:

**FWDC 12: Modifications to Post-Tenure Review**  
Faculty Handbook [Section 3.7](#), ([SD6615S](#)) ([SD1914F](#)) ([SD5813S](#)) ([SD1413F](#))  
([SD2711S](#)) ([SD1000F](#)) ([SD6405S](#)) ([SD0208F](#)) ([SD0709F](#))

**Effective date:** Fall 2016

**Summary:** This document makes minor modifications and clarifications to Post-Tenure Review (PTR).

**Rationale:** The 2014-15 Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) raised some concerns about procedures and standards for Post-Tenure Review. In response to these concerns, after meeting with members of the PTRC, FWDC proposes the following revisions.

- 1) Clarification of required consultation by the Chair with faculty colleagues. Current language indicates that the Chair “must consult with faculty colleagues,” which is vague. This document stipulates that the Chair should consult, at a minimum, with all tenured faculty members in the department, and may consult with faculty members outside of the department, particularly important for faculty who participate in interdisciplinary programs, or with untenured faculty members (who must have completed mandatory UNC GA-provided PTR training).
- 2) Modification of the timeline, moving PTR earlier in the academic year. Two concerns were expressed: that there was confusion about whether the five-year PTR period included the fall semester in which evaluation occurs, and that PTR takes place at the same time as other personnel decisions (reappointment, tenure, and promotion). FWDC recommends, with concurrence from Academic Affairs, that the PTR timeline be moved forward in the fall semester, with the evaluatee’s statement and supporting material submitted to the Chair in September, the complete dossier assembled by mid-October for the PTRC, and the recommendation to the Dean by March 1.
- 3) Definition of expectations for candidates for PTR. The PTRC expressed some concern about the lack of definition of standards for evaluation. FWDC has determined that the general criteria for personnel decisions articulated in 3.3.3 are the most appropriate for PTR purposes. “Exceeding expectations” is defined in a manner parallel to that used for annual evaluation, namely showing significant accomplishments in one or more areas or consistently performing above expectations in all areas of faculty activity over the five-year PTR period.

## 1) Modify 3.7 as follows:

### 3.7 Post-tenure review ([SD2711S](#)) ([SD1000F](#)) ([SD6405S](#)) ([SD0208F](#)) ([SD0709F](#))

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 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 scholarly or creative activity, and service. The PTR reviews all aspects of performance and creates a summary of several years of professional activity that may address trends not immediately obvious in annual evaluations. 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 VCAA (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 ([SD6615S](#)) ([SD1914F](#)) ([SD5813S](#))

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. Tenured faculty members shall be evaluated every five years. 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 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). 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.

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 1-2, below) to the Chair of his or her department. The Chair will provide items 3-4. The Office of the Provost provides item 5-6. 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 ([SD1413F](#))

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 by the third Monday of October. 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 by the third Monday of September).

2) The Professional Curriculum Vitae (submitted by Evaluatee to Chair by the third Monday of September).

3) Chair's Evaluation (prepared by the Chair, or for the review of Chairs, by the most senior tenured member of the department), as well as any supplementary statement submitted by the evaluatee in response.

4) Quantitative scores and student comments from course evaluations over the PTR review period (provided by the Chair).

5) Annual Faculty Records (past five years, collected by the Office of the Provost)

6) Merit Evaluations (including Dean's or Provost's written explanation of final evaluation and Provost's response to any appeal) (past five years, collected by the Office of the Provost)

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 and the university. 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 briefly outline his or her professional plans for the next five years in the context of the missions of department and university, 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 UNC Asheville 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 UNC Asheville in light of his or her previous levels of activity and responsibilities.

2) Format: The curriculum vitae 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, papers/publications/artistic activities, grant activities, professional consultancies and major service activities.

#### D. Materials supporting professional activity (submitted by evaluatee to Department Chair [by the third Monday of September](#), if requested)

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

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 and Scholarly or 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. Chair's Evaluation (provided by the Chair of the department and assembled in the dossier submitted to the PTRC by the third Monday of October)

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 and the university and providing a clear recommendation as to whether the evaluatee exceeded, met, or did not meet expectations, where faculty expectations are defined in section 3.3.3. 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 all tenured faculty colleagues in the department and report on that consultation. It is not expected that a department vote is taken or reported. The Chair may consult with untenured faculty (who have completed GA-provided PTR training modules) or with tenured faculty members outside of the department at their discretion. For purposes of faculty development, the Chair should discuss the evaluation with the faculty member prior to submission of the evaluation to the PTRC.

**2) Modify 3.7.3.1 as follows:**

### **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 as defined below 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*. For purposes of PTR, to be evaluated as exceeding expectations, a faculty member should either: (1) have significant accomplishments in at least one area of faculty activity while meeting expectations in all other areas over the five-year PTR period, or (2) consistently perform above expectations in all areas of faculty activity over the five-year PTR period. 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*. For purposes of PTR, to be evaluated as meeting expectations, a faculty member should show satisfactory performance in all three areas of faculty activity over the five-year PTR period as defined in section 3.3.3. 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.

6. The provost must annually certify that all aspects of the post-tenure review process are in compliance with [Policy 400.3.3 of the UNC Policy Manual](#) and any associated guidelines adopted by the president of the University.