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**1. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY (Post-Tenure Review)**

1.1 Tenured faculty must undergo a cumulative review process every five years, following the award of tenure (or following the award of promotion, if such review occurs within the five-year period after tenure review). Post-tenure review evaluates all aspects of performance including teaching, scholarship, and service.

1.2 In consultation with department chairs, faculty shall develop five year goal(s) or plans that should include milestones that are aligned with annual performance evaluation. These plans can be modified annually by the faculty member, in consultation with the department chair.

1.3 Waiver of the periodic performance evaluation review may be granted by the Provost for faculty who have made an official decision to retire within two years from the date the review is scheduled to begin. Request for the waiver should be made in writing by the faculty member and must include notice of the confirmed date of retirement. In the event that personal or departmental exigencies create circumstances that warrant a delay in the planned retirement date, the faculty member must complete the performance evaluation review in the next year.

1.4 Faculty members’ performance will be evaluated relative to the mission of UNCP. The purpose of this review is to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by (a) continuing tenure for faculty whose performance has been found to “meet or exceed expectations,” (b) providing a clear plan and a specified time line of not more than three years for improvement of performance of faculty whose performance has been found to “not meet expectations,” and (c) for those whose performance continues to “not meet expectations,” providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which may include a recommendation for discharge in the most serious cases of incompetence.

1.5 In response to the July 7, 2014, request of the Board of Governors and General Administration of The University of North Carolina, the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee (FERS) of the University of North Carolina at Pembroke has revised this document outlining UNC Pembroke’s post-tenure review process. It is felt that this document adheres not only to (1) UNC Policy 400.3.3 Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, Revised June 20, 2014; (2) UNC Policy 400.3.3 [G] Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, Revised June 20, 2014, and (3) Chapter VI of *The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina*, but that it also parallels and reflects the basic tenets of the Faculty Evaluation Model as found in the UNCP Faculty Handbook. It must furthermore be noted that nothing in this Post-Tenure document prohibits the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor from making personnel decisions and taking personnel actions relative to reappointment, non-reappointment, and dismissal of faculty in warranted cases as indicated by the dismissal, non-reappointment, and termination policies of the University of North Carolina at Pembroke (UNCP Faculty Handbook, Section II, Chapter 1) and *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*.

1.6 In the words of the Executive Summary of the Report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review that was approved by the UNC Board of Governors on 16 May 1997, "Post-tenure review is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality” (I). This document further states that "institutional policies shall explicitly involve peers in the review process." In addition, it was noted in that report that the recommendations contained therein were intended "to strengthen the system of tenure and academic freedom while assuring on-going quality in the teaching, research, and service mission of the University of North Carolina."

1.7 Thus presented below are the necessary 1) principles and criteria upon which the UNCP post-tenure review process is based, 2) principles governing the roles of individuals and groups, 3) evaluation procedures to be followed, 4) forms needed for the cumulative evaluation of tenured faculty, 5) a calendar of events for cumulative evaluation of tenured faculty, and 6) a specified time line of not more than three academic years for the implementation of the review process.

**2. PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA**

2.1 Faculty at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke who are tenured must undergo the cumulative review process outlined below every five years, following the award of tenure. The purpose of this review is to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by (a) continuing tenure for faculty whose work is found to “meet or exceed expectations,” (b) providing a clear plan and a specified time line of not more than three academic years for improvement of performance of faculty found to “not meet expectations,” and (c) for those whose performance continues to “not meet expectations,” providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which may include in the most serious cases of incompetence a recommendation for discharge. (“A faculty member, who is the beneficiary of institutional guarantees of tenure, shall enjoy protection against unjust and arbitrary application of disciplinary penalties. During the period of such guarantees the faculty member may be discharged or suspended from employment or diminished in rank only for reasons of incompetence, neglect of duty or misconduct of such nature as to indicate that the individual is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty” (*The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*, Section 603(1), <http://www.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php>).

2.2 All UNCP faculty are evaluated annually in three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service) according to a four-category Standard Performance Rating Scale. This annual review includes a(n) (a) Self-Evaluation Report, (b) Student Evaluation Report, (c) Chair’s Evaluation Report, (d) Chair’s Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation, (e) Dean’s Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase, and (f) recommendation of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. In addition to these reports, Evaluations for Contract Renewal and Evaluations for Tenure and/or Promotion include a Peer Evaluation Report. The latter of these evaluation processes also includes a Tenure and Promotion Evaluation Report. The comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review process outlined herein for tenured faculty in no way detracts from, replaces, or diminishes the importance and significance of this annual performance review. Furthermore, a comprehensive review undertaken for promotion decision purposes may preclude the need for the cumulative review process outlined in this document until the fifth year following such review. As is true for all phases of the UNCP faculty evaluation model, a faculty member has the right to receive written feedback and to submit a rebuttal to any aspect of reports submitted by Deans, Department Chairs or Peer Evaluation Committees.

2.3 Written feedback from the Department Chair and Dean should include recognition for exemplary performance. A negative review must 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. Any faculty response to a negative review will be forwarded with the packet to all subsequent levels of review.

2.4 In situations where a faculty member has received a rating of “does not meet expectations,” an individual development or career plan will be created that includes (a) specific steps designed to lead to improvement, (b) a specified time line in which improvement is expected to occur, and (c) a clear statement of consequences should adequate improvement not occur within the designated time line. These consequences may include dismissal as allowed by the UNC Code, 603 (1). During the period allowed for improvement, the Department Chair or Dean (in the case of a Department Chair) will meet with the faculty member on at least a semi-annual basis to review progress toward meeting the development plan’s specifications. If the faculty member’s duties are modified as a result of a “does not meet expectations” rating, the revised duties are specified in the development plan.

2.5 All phases of this evaluation process are to be guided by the principles set forth in the UNCP Faculty Evaluation Model (UNCP Faculty Handbook). Thus all “Principles and Criteria” relevant to faculty evaluation detailed in that document are also relevant to the post-tenure evaluation process and consequently are not repeated in this present document. These include principles and definitions, criteria, and documentation for the evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service.

**3. PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE ROLES OF INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS** **FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW**

3.1 The Faculty Member Being Evaluated

3.1.1 All tenured faculty will undergo a cumulative review process every five years following the award of tenure. If during that period, the tenured faculty member is promoted, this cumulative review will not be necessary until the fifth year following the promotion review. When tenured faculty apply for promotion and undergo post-tenure review at the same time, separate decisions will be made on each. As indicated in the UNCP Faculty Evaluation Model, the faculty member’s self-evaluations should be “a primary source of information about the goals, methods, and degrees of success associated with his or her performance.” As is also stated therein, the annual weights assigned to each area by the individual being evaluated are to be taken into account by subsequent evaluators. Furthermore, the candidate has the right to submit a rebuttal pertaining to any aspect of the reports submitted by the Department Chair or the Peer Evaluation Committee or Dean.

3.2 Students

3.2.1 As is the case with all evaluation procedures at UNCP, student evaluations, while thought to play a prominent role in evaluating the faculty member’s teaching, do not by themselves provide sufficient information to judge fully a faculty member’s performance as a teacher. Hence, evaluation of teaching effectiveness at UNCP involves a variety of types of documentation. (For more information on the role that students play in the evaluation process at UNCP, see the section above on “Student Evaluation of Instruction.)

3.3 The Peer Evaluation Committee

3.3.1 The department or unit selects the Peer Evaluation Committee by a process agreed upon by the tenured faculty within the department or unit. The faculty member being evaluated cannot make the final selection of Committee members. The Peer Evaluation Committee is responsible for preparing and submitting a Peer Evaluation Report to the Dean of the faculty member’s college or school. This group is responsible for gathering appropriate information, assessing its implications, and formulating a coherent evaluation of the faculty member’s performance. Following completion of the Peer Evaluation Committee’s work, the Department Chair (or Dean, if the faculty member concerned is the Department Chair) must consult with the Committee before completing his or her evaluation.

3.4 The Department Chair (or Dean for Department Chairs)

3.4.1 The Department Chair (Dean of the Chair’s school or college for Department Chairs), subsequent to the completion of the Peer Evaluation Committee Evaluation and consultation with the Peer Evaluation Committee, is responsible for writing his/her own recommendations (see Format for Faculty Evaluation Reports), and submitting this document to the Dean.

3.5 The Dean of the Faculty Member’s School or College

3.5.1 The Dean will review the reports from the Chair and from the Peer Evaluation Committee as well as any supporting materials and rebuttals. The Dean will assess the performance of the faculty member based on the materials presented and will complete the Dean’s Recommendation for Post-Tenure Review. The Dean will give the faculty member a copy of the Dean’s recommendation and submit that recommendation, with all attached materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

3.6 The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

3.6.1 Based on the materials submitted by the Dean, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for taking appropriate actions concerning the status of each tenured faculty member who has undergone the cumulative review process. (For further information regarding the responsibilities of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, see the section below on “Evaluation Procedures”). The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the faculty member, the faculty member’s Department Chair (or Dean for Department Chairs), and the Dean of the relevant college or school, will also be responsible for constructing, monitoring, and evaluating a “meets or exceeds expectations” level of completion of any plan for improvement of performance for any faculty member whose performance has been judged to “not meet expectations.” The Provost must certify that all aspects of the post-tenure review process are in compliance with policy and guidelines.

3.7 The Chancellor

3.7.1 After reviewing the materials produced by this evaluation process, the Chancellor takes actions as deemed appropriate. In situations where a tenured faculty member has received a rating of “does not meet expectations~~,~~” and the identified deficiencies are not removed in the specified period of time, the Chancellor may impose sanctions, which may include discharge as allowed by *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*, Section 603 (1).

**4. EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

4.1 The cumulative evaluation for tenured faculty provides a basis for the support and encouragement of excellence among tenured faculty by (a) continuing tenure for faculty whose work is found to “meet or exceed expectations,” (b) providing a clear plan and a specified time line of not more than three academic years for improvement of performance of faculty found to “not meet expectations,” and (c) for those whose performance “does not meet expectations,” providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which can include a recommendation for discharge. All tenured faculty will undergo this cumulative review process every five years. If during that period, the tenured faculty member is evaluated for promotion, this cumulative review may not be necessary until the fifth year following the conclusion of that process. The cumulative review process includes the faculty member, the Peer Evaluation Committee, the Department Chair (or Dean’s evaluation of the Department Chair~~s~~), the Dean of the faculty member’s college or school, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor. The institution will provide ongoing support and training for all post-tenure evaluators, including peer review committee members, department chairs or deans. The Provost will certify that required training has been conducted.

4.2 At the point in time when the cumulative evaluation for tenured faculty process is to begin, the faculty member involved will be so notified in writing by his/her Department Chair or by the Dean of the relevant college or school if the review involves the Department Chair (see Calendar of Events below). The faculty member will subsequently submit to his or her Department Chair (Dean of relevant college or school for Department Chairs) a copy of (a) Self Evaluations for the previous five years, (b) Student Evaluation summaries for the previous five years, (c) Chair Evaluations for the previous five years, (d) Dean’s annual evaluation reports for the previous five years, (e) any additional information since the last annual evaluation that is deemed pertinent, and (f) a completed copy of the Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form . In the initial stages of this process, these various materials might be collected from a variety of sources (the faculty member’s own copies, copies in the possession of the Department Chair, and/or copies in the possession of the Office for Academic Affairs).

4.3 The Department Chair (or Dean for Department Chairs) then (a) appoints three faculty members to the Peer Evaluation Committee in the manner described above, (b) calls this group together for its initial meeting in order to orient the members to the process, and (c) makes available to the members the materials cited above.

4.4 The responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee will be consistent with those described in the sections above on other evaluation processes. The Peer Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair (Dean of relevant college or school ~~for~~ if Department Chair~~s~~ is being evaluated), are responsible for preparing and submitting a Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Form (available from the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/aa/forms/>) to the Dean of the faculty member’s college or school and, through the Dean, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. These reports, based on the various documents that have been submitted, will include a rating of the overall performance of the faculty member as “exceeds expectations, meets expectations or does not meet expectations,” and a narrative justification. If the ranking indicates “does not meet expectations,” the Committee’s report has the option of including specific suggestions that might lead to improvement. The faculty member undergoing this cumulative post-tenure review process will be given two completed, signed, and dated copies of each of these reports (the Peer Evaluation Committee’s report and the Department Chair’s report). Within three days, the faculty member being evaluated returns one copy that has been signed and dated. This signature indicates merely that the faculty member acknowledges being apprised of its contents, not that he/she agrees with it. In all cases, the faculty member being reviewed may submit a rebuttal to the Dean within ten days of having received these reports. The respective Chair (Peer Evaluation Committee or Department) submits these two reports to the Dean of the faculty member’s school or college.

4.5 The Dean of the relevant college or school will review the reports from the Department Chair (if the evaluated member is not the department Chair) and the Peer Evaluation Committee, including any supporting materials provided by the Chair or Peer Evaluation Committee and any rebuttals submitted by the faculty member being evaluated. The Dean will then complete the Dean’s Report for Post-Tenure Review, including his or her evaluation of the faculty member’s performance as “exceeds expectations, meets expectations or does not meet expectations.” The Dean’s Report will serve as a cover letter to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and will include as attachments the reports from the Department Chair and from the Peer Evaluation Committee along with all supporting documents. Within three days, the faculty member will sign the Dean’s Report, acknowledging having seen it but not necessarily agreement with it. The faculty member will retain one copy of the signed Dean’s Recommendation. The Dean will then forward his or her report, with the attached materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

4.6 If the Dean does not agree with the evaluation of the Chair and/or the Peer Evaluation Committee, the Dean must justify that judgment with appropriate comments. The faculty member has the right to submit a rebuttal to the Dean’s evaluation within 10 days of signing the report.

4.7 The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will review the Dean’s report, with the reports of the Department Chair and the Peer Evaluation Committee and all supporting documents attached. In the event that the ratings in the reports submitted unanimously indicate “does not meet expectations,” the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will communicate this finding in writing to the faculty member, the Department Chair (unless the faculty member is the Department Chair), and the Dean of the faculty member’s college or school. It will be responsibility of the Department Chair (or Dean if the faculty member concerned is the Department Chair), in collaboration with the faculty member evaluated, to draw up an individual development or career (remediation) plan. The plan will include steps designed to lead to improvement in the faculty member’s performance to a “meets expectations” level, a specified time frame of not more than three academic years in which this improvement is to occur, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement to a “meets expectations” level of performance not occur within the specified time frame. After review and concurrence by the Dean of the faculty member’s college or school, the plan will be submitted to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who must approve the plan, taking into account the need for institutional resources to support the faculty member’s efforts to remediate identified deficiencies in his or her performance.

4.8 At the end of the time period specified in the remediation plan, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the faculty member’s Department Chair (Dean, if the faculty member is a Department Chair), and Dean of the faculty member’s college or school, will determine if the provisions of the plan have been met. If so, the faculty member will be judged to have “met expectations” in performance for the current post-tenure review cycle. Note that the existence of a remediation plan does not defer or postpone any succeeding post-tenure review. If the provisions of the remediation plan have not been met and the required improvement not occurred, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall recommend sanctions to the Chancellor, under the provisions of University policy on Discharge and the Imposition of Serious Sanctions and *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*. Such sanctions may include reduction in rank, discharge, or other disciplinary action.

4.9 If performance ratings unanimously indicate meets or exceeds expectations performance or if there is disagreement among the reports on the performance of the faculty member being evaluated, the Provost and Chancellor for Academic Affairs will accept the performance review report with no further action. In the case where a faculty member’s performance is found to “not meet expectations,” the Provost will take appropriate action (s). If any elements of performance that “do not meet expectations” have not been improved to a “meets or exceeds expectations” level in the specified period, the Provost’s action may include discharge as specified by *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina* Section 603 (1).

**5. TYPICAL CALENDAR OF EVENTS FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW**

5.1 The events listed below are intended as guidelines; dates may be altered as conditions warrant. Specific policies and procedures are found elsewhere in this document and in the full UNCP Faculty Evaluation Model. If a date listed in this table falls on a weekend or holiday, the deadline is automatically moved to the next business day.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DATE** | **EVENT OR DOCUMENT** |
| April 15 | Notification: Department Chair notifies faculty member that the post-tenure review process will occur during the following academic year. |
| August 1 | Optional Promotion Review: If a faculty member wishes to undergo review for promotion in addition to a required post-tenure review, the faculty member must notify the Department Chair by this date. |
| August 15 | Evaluation Announcement: If the faculty member wishes to undergo review for promotion in addition to the required post-tenure review, the Department Chair notifies the Dean, the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC), and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the impending promotion evaluation by this date. The faculty member should receive a copy of this notification. |
| August 29 | Submission of Materials: The faculty member presents the Department Chair with the required documents. [In the initial stages of this process, these various materials might be collected from a variety of sources (the faculty member's own copies, copies in the possession of the Department Chair, and/or copies in the possession of the Office of Academic Affairs).] |
| September 7 | PEC Formation: The Department Chair announces the composition of the Peer Evaluation Committee (PEC). |
| September 17 | Transmittal of Materials: By this date, the Department Chair meets with the PEC, reviews its charge, and gives the PEC the candidate's materials. The PEC elects its chair after meeting with the dept chair. |
| September 17 – November 1 | Optional observation of teaching (when deemed appropriate) is carried out by Department Chair and members of the Peer Evaluation Committee. The PEC independently deliberates on all materials, observations, etc., to reach a recommendation. The PEC Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Form is completed by the PEC. (Section II, Chapter 2) |
| November 5 | Two copies of the PEC Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation form are transmitted to the faculty member. |
| Report transmittal + 3 business days | Faculty member being evaluated signs/dates form from PEC. The faculty member retains one signed copy. |
| November 5 | Department Chair, after consultation with the PEC, completes the Chair’s Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Form. (Section II, Chapter 2) |
| November 5 | Two copies of the Chair’s Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation form are transmitted to the faculty member. |
| Report transmittal + 3 business days | Faculty member being evaluated signs/dates form from Department Chair. The faculty member retains one signed copy. |
| November 8 | PEC and chair reports are submitted, along with the candidate’s materials to the Dean |
| Report transmittals + 10 business days | [Optional] Faculty member being evaluated submits rebuttal to report(s) to the Dean. |
| December 1 | For candidates undergoing concomitant review for promotion, Dean reviews Chair and PEC post-tenure report forms, supporting materials, including rebuttals, and completes the Dean’s Recommendation for Post-Tenure Review (Form 4-12.M). By deadline, Dean gives the faculty member and Department Chair, a copy of the Dean’s recommendation and submits that recommendation, with all attached post-tenure materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. |
| January 15 | For candidates not undergoing concomitant review for promotion, Dean reviews Chair and PEC reports, supporting materials, including rebuttals, and completes the Dean’s Recommendation for Post-Tenure Review (Form 4-12.M). By deadline, Dean gives the faculty member and Department Chair, a copy of the Dean’s recommendation and submits that recommendation, with all attached materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. |
| February 15 | Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs confers with the Dean concerning outcome of evaluation process |
| March 15 | Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs gives recommendations to Chancellor. |
| December 1 | Following successful outcome of Tenure/Promotion a Five Year Plan is submitted to the Chair (Dean, if Chair was evaluated). |