

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT ASHEVILLE
FACULTY SENATE

Senate Document Number 9118S
Date of Senate Approval 05/03/18

Statement of Faculty Senate Action:

FWDC 16: Revisions to PTR Process

Effective date: Fall 2018

Summary: This document clarifies the timing of the first post-tenure review in order to prevent overlap in review years. It further clarifies the time range possible for subsequent reviews following the implementation of a development plan.

Rationale: Members of the 2017-2018 PTRC suggested these changes in order to improve clarity for both PTR candidates and PTRC members, and to ensure that reviews do not occur more often than warranted.

Revise 3.7.2, item 2 as follows:

3.7.2 Procedure for Evaluation ([SD1317F](#)) ([SD7516S](#)) ([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 first post-tenure review covers the five academic years following the academic year in which a successful tenure application was considered. Likewise, when a faculty member is promoted to the rank of Professor, the subsequent PTR period covers the five academic years following the year in which the application for promotion was considered.** The Provost may approve the postponement of Post-Tenure Review in a case of illness, leave of absence, family emergency or other similar circumstances.

Revise 3.7.3, item 3B as follows:

3.7.3 Results of Post-Tenure Review (SD7516S) (SD1914F)

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. The PTRC 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, who makes the final evaluation:

A. The evaluatee now meets or exceeds expectations. The PTRC 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~~ **no more than 1 year**.

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.