

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

Policy for the Cumulative Review of Permanently Tenured Faculty East Carolina University

Preamble

On May 16, 1997, the Board of Governors mandated the review of performance of tenured faculty in the University of North Carolina system. This review, defined as the comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, has the purposes of ensuring faculty development and promoting faculty vitality. The June 24, 1997, Administrative Memorandum #371 from the General Administration of the UNC System required each constituent institution to create a policy that examines individual faculty contributions to departmental, school/college, and university goals as well as to the academic programs in which faculty teach. Guidelines mandate that the process shall recognize and reward exemplary faculty performance; provide for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found deficient; and, for those whose performance remains deficient, provide for the possible imposition of appropriate sanctions or further action. Further guidelines direct individual institutions to show the relationship between annual review and cumulative review, examine faculty performance relative to the mission of the unit and the university, include a review no less frequently than every five years, explicitly involve peers in the review process, assure written feedback as well as a mechanism for faculty response to the evaluation, and require individual development plans for all faculty receiving less than satisfactory ratings in the cumulative review.

East Carolina University's Policy for the Cumulative Review of Permanently Tenured Faculty meets the guidelines of the University of North Carolina General Administration and is consistent with East Carolina University's Faculty Manual and the Code of the University. This policy does not create a process for the reevaluation or revalidation of tenured status. The basic standard for appraisal and evaluation is whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties associated with his or her position. Furthermore, the policy is created with the widespread presumption of competence on the part of each tenured faculty member. The cumulative review for a faculty member must reflect the nature of the individual's field or work and must conform to fair and reasonable expectations as recognized by faculty peers in each department and discipline. The review must be conducted in a manner free of arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory elements and must follow these agreed-upon procedures.

Description of Policy

Timing. At five-year intervals, beginning with academic year 1998-1999, each permanently tenured faculty member shall have a review of all aspects of his or her professional performance during the review interval. A review undertaken to decide on promotion qualifies as a cumulative review. A faculty member granted permanent tenure shall be reviewed within five years of the granting of tenure. Probationary-term faculty members are excluded because other review mechanisms exist to evaluate their performance. Unit* administrators, deans, and administrators at the division or university level shall be excluded from this policy. After returning to full-time teaching/research responsibilities, administrators shall be evaluated in their fifth year and following five-year intervals.

Each academic unit shall decide whether all of its tenured faculty will be reviewed in the same year or whether its tenured faculty will be reviewed according to a serial plan. Those units choosing a serial plan shall also determine the method of serialization.

Performance Standards for the Review. For the cumulative review of performance for the five-year period, the unit's Tenure Committee shall draft standards of "exemplary," "satisfactory," and "deficient" performance, taking into account the provisions of Appendix C, Section I, C and D of the ECU Faculty Manual, the unit's code provisions, and the primacy of teaching/advising within the UNC system institutions. These standards should be consistent with changing goals of the unit and the university while also considering varying expectations at the time of the granting of permanent tenure for individual faculty members.

The Tenure Committee shall submit the proposed standards to the unit administrator for concurrence or nonconcurrence. At that point, two possible actions may occur. (1) If the unit administrator concurs, he or she shall forward the standards to the next higher administrator. If the next higher administrator does not agree with the standards developed by the Tenure Committee and concurred with by the unit administrator, every effort (including discussion and negotiation) shall be made to resolve the differences. If the effort fails, the matter shall be referred to the next higher administrator who may accept the standards or return them for revision. (2) When the unit administrator and Tenure Committee disagree, every effort (including discussion and negotiation) shall be made to resolve the differences within the unit. If the effort fails, the matter shall be referred to the next higher administrator who may accept the standards or return them for revision. In either case, any amendment to these standards must be approved by a vote of at least 2/3 of the Tenure Committee and follow the same process for initially proposed standards.

Cumulative Review Committee (CRC). The Tenure Committee will elect three faculty members and one alternate from the permanently tenured faculty to serve on the Cumulative Review Committee. The alternate shall serve when a member is unable to serve or is deemed by the Tenure Committee to have a conflict of interest.

When a unit is unable to elect three permanently tenured voting faculty members not holding administrative status, the next higher administrator above the unit level shall appoint permanently tenured faculty from other units to increase the committee's membership to three members and one alternate. These appointments to the committee must be from one list of candidates selected by a vote of the permanently tenured and probationary-term faculty of the unit. The list forwarded to the next higher administrator by the appropriate faculty will contain at least twice the number of faculty members required to complete the membership of the committee. Before voting on the list to be forwarded to the next higher administrator, the voting faculty will ascertain that faculty members nominated to have their names placed on the list are willing and able to serve in this important capacity. The list of faculty names recommended to the next higher administrator may not be returned for revision.

Review Process. Cumulative Review of Permanently Tenured Faculty shall cover all aspects of the faculty member's professional performance and be based on the faculty member's five most recent annual reports and five most recent annual performance evaluations (ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix C, Section III. Evaluations) for the cumulative review period. The review shall take into account the faculty member's contribution for the period to the mission of the unit, the school or college, and the university.

The initial review shall be conducted by the unit administrator who, using the attached Form A or Form B, shall prepare a summary report which categorizes each faculty member's performance as exemplary, satisfactory, or deficient. The report, together with the annual reports and annual performance evaluations, shall be reviewed by the Cumulative Review Committee. For each faculty member, the Cumulative Review Committee shall either agree or disagree with the findings of the unit administrator.

When the unit administrator and the Cumulative Review Committee agree, the unit administrator shall report the results of the cumulative review in writing to the faculty member and place a copy of the written evaluation in the faculty member's personnel file. Faculty whose cumulative review reflects exemplary performance shall be recognized and rewarded.

When the unit administrator and Cumulative Review Committee disagree, every effort (including discussion and negotiation) will be made to resolve the differences within the unit. If the effort to resolve differences fails, the matter will be referred to the next higher administrator for final decision.

Reconsideration. A faculty member whose review process determines a deficient performance level shall have the opportunity to respond within 20 calendar days. The faculty member may request that the unit administrator and Cumulative Review Committee reconsider the evaluation based on additional substantive information provided by the faculty member. In reconsidering the evaluation, the unit administrator and Cumulative Review Committee shall have the opportunity to nullify, modify, or reconfirm the original evaluation.

If, upon reconsideration, the unit administrator and Cumulative Review Committee disagree, every effort (including discussion and negotiation) shall be made to resolve the differences within the unit. If the effort fails, the matter shall be referred to the next higher administrator for final decision.

The unit administrator shall report the decision in writing to the faculty member and place a copy of the report in the faculty member's personnel file.

Faculty Development Plan. A faculty member whose cumulative review reflects deficient performance shall negotiate a formal development plan with the Cumulative Review Committee and the unit administrator. The development plan must identify specific strengths and weaknesses and also define specific goals or outcomes that would help the faculty member overcome the identified weaknesses. It should also outline activities, set guidelines, indicate approved criteria by which the faculty member could monitor his or her progress, and identify the source of any institutional commitments, if required. The development plan shall set reasonable time limits, not to exceed three academic years from the implementation of the plan. The plan shall represent a commitment by the faculty member, the Cumulative Review Committee, and the unit administrator to improve the faculty member's performance and provide adequate resources to support the plan. The plan shall be consistent with the faculty member's academic freedom (as defined by the ECU Faculty Manual, Part III), shall be self-directed by the faculty member, and shall be sufficiently flexible to allow for subsequent alteration if necessary. If the unit administrator, Cumulative Review Committee, and faculty member cannot agree on a formal development plan, a draft of the plan, with objections from any of the parties, will be forwarded to the next higher administrator, who will make the final decision. The faculty member's development progress shall be reviewed annually by the Cumulative Review Committee and the unit administrator, who shall provide a written evaluation of progress to the faculty member.

Subsequent Evaluation. If the faculty member's cumulative performance level is satisfactory within the designated period of time, the unit administrator shall report the results of the cumulative review in writing to the faculty member and place a copy of the written evaluation in the faculty member's personnel file. The faculty member will undergo another cumulative review at the beginning of the next cumulative review interval. If the faculty member's cumulative performance level remains deficient after the designated period, the unit administrator may recommend that serious sanctions be imposed as governed by Appendix D, Section VI, "Due Process Before Discharge or Imposition of Serious Sanction," of the ECU Faculty Manual and the Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina.

*With respect to personnel matters relating to Cumulative Review, academic units are defined as departments described in the codes of operation of professional schools, the departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, professional schools without departments, Academic Library Services, Health Sciences Library, and any other units in which faculty appointments are made. In the College of Arts and Sciences and in professional schools whose unit codes describe departmental structures, departmental chairs are the unit administrators. In schools that do not have departments described in their unit codes, the dean of the school is the unit administrator.

Enclosures: Form A and B

Cumulative Review of Permanently Tenured Faculty
East Carolina University
 Form A

Faculty member: _____ School/department: _____

Date: _____

I. Summary of Annual Evaluations:

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
A. Teaching/advising					
B. Research or creative productivity					
C. Professional service					
D. Patient Care					
E. Other duties					
OVERALL					

II. Cumulative Review Evaluation:

_____ Exemplary

_____ Satisfactory

_____ Deficient*

*A "deficient" evaluation must be accompanied by a written justification for this finding.

Submitted by: _____
Unit Administrator Date

Cumulative Review Committee Response: _____ Agree
 _____ Disagree

Committee Chair Date

Cumulative Review of Permanently Tenured Faculty
East Carolina University
Form B

Faculty member: _____ School/department: _____

Date: _____

I. Summary of Annual Evaluations:

Cumulative Review Evaluation:

_____ Exemplary

_____ Satisfactory

_____ Deficient*

*A "deficient" evaluation must be accompanied by a written justification for this finding.

Submitted by: _____
Unit Administrator

_____ Date

Cumulative Review Committee Response:

_____ Agree

_____ Disagree

_____ Committee Chair

_____ Date

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Performance Review of Tenured Faculty

NUMBER: 371

DATE: June 24, 1997

Background

At its meeting on May 16, 1997, the Board of Governors adopted the recommendations in the Report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-tenure Review. A copy of that report is attached. Post-tenure review is defined in the report as "a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality".

The report asserts that review of the performance of tenured faculty in the University shall be "to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by:

1. recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance,
2. providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found deficient, and
3. for those whose performance remains deficient, providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which may, in the most serious cases, include a recommendation for discharge".

The report also provides broad principles for carrying out such reviews but leaves room for each institution to develop the details of its own process within one year following the release of guidelines by General Administration. In keeping with Section 6.02 of *The Code*, the Board of Trustees of each constituent institution shall adopt the policies and regulations governing performance reviews of tenured faculty. Institutional policies and procedures will also be approved by the Board of Governors and should be included in all appropriate documents of the constituent institutions .

The report further specifies that "developing a system of post-tenure review will require re-examination of the effectiveness of current faculty personnel policies as well as planning and program review policies" (p.13). Initiation of these performance reviews in the University of North Carolina provides constituent institutions with an opportunity to create a policy that examines individual faculty contributions to departmental, school/college, and university goals as well as to the academic programs in which faculty teach. Thoughtful attention to the ways in which post-tenure review can promote faculty vitality across their careers will assure that such reviews lead to increased effectiveness within the university.

Guidelines to assist in formulating institutional policy concerning performance reviews of tenured faculty are as follows.

Guidelines

The following guidelines shall be observed in developing your institutional policies and procedures for post-tenure review:

- 1) Institutions shall develop policies and procedures for implementing post-tenure review. Institutions are encouraged to send a draft of their proposals for initial review by May 1, 1998. Proposals must be submitted no later than July 1, 1998. Implementation of approved policies will begin in the 1998-99 academic year.
- 2) Institutional policy statements shall show the relationship between the annual performance review of tenured faculty and the post-tenure review.
- 3) Institutional reviews shall provide for the evaluation of all aspects of the professional

performance of faculty whose primary responsibilities are teaching, and / or research, and / or service.

- 4) Institutional policies shall assure that faculty performance will be examined relative to the mission of the institution, college, and program.
- 5) Institutional policies shall assure that each tenured faculty member undergoes a cumulative review no less frequently than every five years. (Note: a review undertaken to grant tenure or to decide on promotion qualifies as such a Cumulative review.)
- 6) Institutional policies shall explicitly involve peers in the review process.
- 7) Institutional policies shall assure that there is written feedback to the faculty member being reviewed as well as a mechanism for faculty response to the evaluation.
- 8) Institutional policies shall be in compliance with the criteria and procedures for due process and for discharge or other disciplinary action established in Chapter VI of The Code of the University.
- 9) Institutional policies shall require individual development or career plans for all faculty receiving less than satisfactory ratings in the cumulative review. These plans must include specific steps designed to lead to improvement, a specified time line in which improvement is expected to occur, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time line.
- 10) As policies are developed, institutions shall consider resource implications of a meaningful performance review system, identifying in advance the sources of support for the process and its outcomes.