

Tenured Faculty Performance Review Policy

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Purpose

The purpose of Tenured Faculty Performance Review is to provide for the periodic and comprehensive review of the performance of all faculty members who have tenure and whose primary duties are teaching, research, and service. The goals of such a review are to promote faculty development and productivity and provide additional accountability.

Applicability of Review Process

The Tenured Faculty Performance Review process is applicable to all tenured members of the faculty who have been on a continuous contract for a period of five years or more since their last cumulative review. Tenured faculty members ordinarily must undergo a Tenured Faculty Performance Review once every five years; a faculty member shall not be subject to a mandatory Tenured Faculty Performance Review more than once every five years. Department Chairs, Deans, and other administrators whose primary responsibilities are not teaching and research are exempt from a Tenured Faculty Performance Review while they are serving in their administrative posts. Upon returning to full-time faculty duties, they are subject to a Tenured Faculty Performance Review. A faculty member may request postponement of a scheduled Tenured Faculty Performance Review for extenuating personal circumstances, such as health problems. The request for a postponement must be in writing and submitted for approval by the faculty member's Chair and Dean.

Relationship Between Tenured Faculty Performance Review and Review for Promotion

Tenured Faculty Performance Review will be coordinated with the review of a faculty member for promotion in the following ways:

A departmental consideration for promotion five years after a faculty member receives tenure satisfies the requirements for the faculty member's Tenured Faculty Performance Review. One outcome of the promotion review could be a requirement that the faculty member prepare a developmental plan as described below.

If a faculty member *postpones the application* for promotion five years after receiving tenure, he or she will undergo a Tenured Faculty Performance Review. The Tenured Faculty Performance Review, in this case, would satisfy the requirement of a promotion review five years after the award of tenure.

Relationship between Annual Reviews and Tenured Faculty Performance Review

The performance of each faculty member must be reviewed annually by his/her Department Chair. That review must be in writing and provided to the faculty member. Annual performance reviews, however, are not a substitute for the comprehensive, periodic, and cumulative Tenured Faculty Performance Review required by the UNC

Board of Governors and described in this Policy. The Tenured Faculty Performance Review can be informed by annual reviews but must involve additional assessment as described in this Policy.

Procedures

Initiating the Review Process

Whenever a Tenured Faculty Performance Review is initiated, the Chair shall first consult with the faculty member and then shall establish a schedule for the conduct of the review by the Review Committee (see definition below). Ordinarily, a faculty member should be given at least four months' notice that one is to be reviewed.

Review File

To initiate the review process, the Department Chair, in cooperation with the faculty member, shall construct a Tenured Faculty Performance Review file containing **only**: (a) copies of the faculty member's last five annual review letters from the Department Chair; (b) a current curriculum vitae; and (c) an optional statement describing his or her professional accomplishments in teaching, research and service. The faculty member should indicate if his or her responsibilities are limited primarily to only one or two of these areas so that post-tenure review and resulting reviews and recommendations will take these allocations into account. If necessary for clarification, the Chair or Review Committee may request further information.

The Review Committee

The Department Review Committee or a special committee selected by the tenured members of the department shall conduct the review of the faculty member's performance. The Committee shall be selected according to the department, college and University procedures. The faculty member being reviewed does not have the option of selecting members of the Review Committee. The Review Committee shall review the file and may meet with the Chair and the faculty member, either together or separately. The Committee may consult other sources of information not included in the file, if deemed appropriate, with the approval of the Chair. In accordance with the schedule for the review established by the Chair, the Review Committee shall make a written assessment of the faculty member's performance, including, where appropriate, recommendations to the Chair intended to enhance the faculty member's contributions to the unit and the University. The Review Committee Report is advisory to the Chair. The Report shall include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's performance and should also include recognition for exemplary performance. This written assessment shall conclude with one of the following findings:

"Satisfactory" The faculty member has no substantial and chronic performance deficiencies.

"Seriously Deficient" The faculty member has substantial and chronic performance deficiencies. The Review Committee shall state and describe the performance deficiencies in its Report. The Committee shall forward its findings to the Chairperson.

The standards for determining **"seriously deficient"** performance shall be determined by the faculty in each unit, and, when approved by the appropriate Chair and Dean, and by the Provost, shall become part of its Tenured Faculty Performance Review procedures. A determination of "seriously deficient" performance 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.

The Chair shall provide the faculty member being reviewed a copy of both the Review Committee report and the Chair's recommendation. The faculty member will be provided an opportunity to respond in writing. The faculty member's response shall be shared at the next highest administrative level. The report and any response from the faculty member shall be made a part of the faculty member's permanent personnel record.

Review by Chair and Dean

Review by the Chair

The Review Committee submits its written evaluation to the Chair. The Chair may accept or reject the recommendation of the Review Committee. The Chair may reject the Review Committee's recommendation only with compelling evidence, communicated in writing to the faculty member, the Dean and the department Review Committee. The Chair's written appraisal shall include a statement on the extent to which the Chair accepts or rejects the findings and recommendations of the Review Committee report and includes the reasons and evidence for such a conclusion. A recommendation for sanctions to be imposed on the faculty member related to his or her lack of performance under the terms and expectations of a previously agreed upon performance improvement plan will be described in the Chair's written statement.

Review by the Dean

The Chair submits a written appraisal to the Dean. The Dean may accept or reject the Chair's recommendation. The Dean may reject the Chair's recommendation only with compelling evidence. In the event that the Dean's appraisal of the Tenured Faculty Performance Review outcome differs from that provided by the Department Review Committee or the Chair, the Dean will submit the faculty member's review materials to the College Review Committee for an advisory review, and the Dean's objections, reasons and evidence will be communicated in writing. The Dean's response shall be provided to the faculty member, the Chair, and the Provost.

Faculty Appeals

A faculty member dissatisfied with the results of the Tenured Faculty Performance Review and the Chair's subsequent appraisal, or the Dean's acceptance, modification or rejection of it, may pursue any appeal or remedy otherwise available to faculty members relating to matters that affect their employment status. [If discharge or other serious sanctions are imposed as a result of a seriously deficient post-tenure performance review, University regulations are the appeal procedures outlined in Section 8 of the Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of The University of North Carolina at Charlotte will apply.](#) ~~contained in the [Tenure Policies, Procedures, and Regulations of The University of North Carolina at Charlotte.](#)~~ [For lesser actions, a faculty member may pursue an appeal through the UNC Charlotte "Procedures for Resolving Faculty Grievances Arising from Section 607\(3\) of The Code of The University of North Carolina."](#)

Comment [JESH1]: Code 607(3)

Developmental Plan

When the Chair and the Dean agree that the faculty member's performance is seriously deficient, the Chair will require that the faculty member have a written developmental plan designed to improve the faculty member's performance in clearly identified areas over a specified time period. The developmental plan will be prepared jointly by the Chair and faculty member and will include at a minimum: (a) the expectations of the Chair as to how the faculty member can remedy the deficiency or deficiencies in performance or enhance the faculty member's professional accomplishments and contributions to the unit; (b) specific performance goals and objectives, timetables for achieving such goals over a two-to-three year period, and the criteria to be used in measuring progress toward the performance goals; (c) the resources or developmental support, if any, the Chair is willing and able to provide the faculty member to assist in implementing the plan; (d) any adjustment in workload, assignments or responsibilities of the faculty member in order to enhance his or her performance and contribution to the mission of the unit; and (e) consequences that might follow if deficiencies are not corrected. If the faculty member's duties are modified as a result of a determination of "seriously deficient" performance, then the developmental plan should reflect that modification and take into account the new allocation of responsibilities. The use of mentoring peers in all developmental plans is encouraged.

The developmental plan will be reviewed by the Dean, who may make suggestions for improving the plan. When the plan has received the final approval of the faculty member, the Chair, and the Dean, it will be implemented by the faculty member.

Monitoring and Re-evaluation of Performance

Progress towards achieving the goals and timetables set out in the development plan will be reviewed at least semi-annually by the Chair, who will provide detailed feedback to the faculty member and a copy to

the Dean. At the end of the time period specified in the developmental plan, the Chair, in consultation with the Department Review Committee, will review the faculty member's performance and make one of the following recommendations:

- The faculty member has improved his or her performance, and no further action is necessary pending the next regularly scheduled Tenured Faculty Performance Review;
- The faculty member's performance has improved but not at the expected level. The Chair may require an adjustment in the developmental plan or in the faculty member's workload in order to improve further the faculty member's performance; or
- The faculty member's performance remains seriously deficient. The Chairperson may recommend the imposition of appropriate sanctions. Any decision to recommend imposition of serious sanctions should occur only after the widest consultation with the tenured faculty in the department; whether this involves a poll or other mechanism is left up to the department. However, the department is expected to transmit the outcome of such consultation with the senior faculty to the Dean.

In all cases, the Chair's recommendation is forwarded to the faculty member and the Dean.

Dean's Review and the Possible Imposition of Sanctions

The Dean reviews the recommended action:

If the Dean agrees with a departmental recommendation that no further action is necessary, the review process stops pending the next regularly scheduled Tenured Faculty Performance Review.

If the Dean agrees with a recommendation for a workload adjustment, the adjustment is implemented and the review stops pending the next regularly scheduled Tenured Faculty Performance Review.

If the Dean agrees with a departmental recommendation for the imposition of serious sanctions, the Dean forwards this recommendation to the Provost. Serious sanctions may be imposed only in accord with Section 8 of the Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of The University of North Carolina at Charlotte (pp.17-19). Serious sanctions that may be imposed include demotion, salary reduction and, in the most serious cases, may include a recommendation for discharge. A faculty member retains full rights to seek a hearing if the decision is made to impose serious sanctions. Neither a negative review nor an insufficient improvement from a development plan will necessarily result in the imposition of sanctions; such sanctions may be imposed only upon grounds specified in Section 8 of the Tenure Policies. In the imposition of serious sanctions, the burden of proof is on the University to prove that

the serious deficiencies on the developmental plan constitute incompetence or neglect of duty.

If the Dean disagrees with the departmental decision, the departmental and Dean's recommendation are forwarded to the Provost for review.