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In most cases, tenured faculty undergo post-tenure review every five years. Faculty members should consult the department chair to see when particular individuals are slated for review. Faculty members are also urged to consult the UNCW policy on Post-Tenure Review, the guidelines of which the Department of Mathematics and Statistics shall follow.

See http://uncw.edu/fac_handbook/employment/evaluation/post_ten_review.htm_

- Early in the spring semester of each year, the department chair informs faculty members who are required to undergo PTR that semester about the documentation and process to be followed. At that time the chair also announces to the department a timetable for the PTR process, giving specific due dates for each portion of the process (see the list below). Other faculty choosing to be reviewed must notify the department chair of their interest within three weeks of this announcement and follow the timetable. The following timetable of events will then be in effect:
  - the faculty members being reviewed will have at least three weeks from the announcement of the timetable to submit materials to the PTR committee;
  - the PTR committee will then have at least three weeks to review the submitted materials, write reports and submit them to the department chair; the department chair will give a copy of the report of the PTR committee to the respective faculty member immediately upon its receipt;
  - the chair will then have at least two weeks to write the reports to be submitted to the dean;
  - the faculty members being reviewed will then have at least one week to read the chair's report and respond if desired;
  - the chair will then submit the PTR report and response of faculty (if a response is written) to the dean.

- The standard period for review shall be Jan/current yr-5 - Jan/current yr. (such as Jan/07-Jan/12).

- The PTR committee shall consist of four elected tenured faculty members - two full professors and two non full professors. The members will serve two year staggered terms. Each year a full professor and a non full professor will be elected. A faculty member is not eligible for election if he/she is to undergo PTR in either of the two years to be served. The PTR committee will elect its chair. If a member of the committee is unable to finish his/her term, an eligible faculty member is elected to complete the term.
• Each faculty member up for PTR shall submit an electronic copy (in the format below) of the following materials to the PTR committee. All materials should cover the five year period under review.
  1. Courses taught
  2. Theses directed
  3. All evaluations of teaching, to include (a) SPOT summary (Requested from Institutional Research by department chair) and (b) all peer classroom evaluation summaries generated by the Policy On Peer Evaluation In The Classroom.
  4. Publications
  5. Professional presentations
  6. Service activities
  7. Annual evaluation summaries done by the department chair at the end of each year up for review. (These evaluations, along with any written faculty responses are to be provided by the chair to the faculty member at least three weeks before materials are due to the committee.)
  8. A statement limited to one page from the faculty member (optional; this may include any additional activities over the review period). (This statement does not substitute for a statement by the faculty member in response to the chair’s PTR review.)

• The PTR committee will write a short review of each faculty member’s performance that addresses each of the areas of teaching, research, and service and characterizes the faculty member’s overall performance as exemplary, satisfactory, or deficient as defined below. This review shall be given to the department chair who will provide a copy to the faculty member.

• Using the PTR committee report as advice, the chair will write an evaluation relative to the mission of the university, college/school, and program. The chair’s evaluation shall state whether the faculty member’s overall professional performance has been exemplary, satisfactory, or deficient as defined below. The chair shall provide a copy of the evaluation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The faculty member and chair shall sign the evaluation in acknowledgement of its receipt by the faculty member. The faculty member has the option of attaching a written response. The chair shall forward a list of the peer evaluators, a copy of the evaluation, and the faculty member’s response, if any, to the dean.

• Criteria for satisfactory faculty performance are professional competence; conscientious discharge of duties, taking into account distribution of workload as assigned by the department chair; and efforts to improve performance. Criteria for exemplary faculty performance are sustained excellence in teaching,
research/artistic achievement, and service; and professional performance that is substantially above expectations and that significantly exceeds the performance of most faculty. Deficient faculty performance is performance that does not meet the criteria for being judged satisfactory, as stated above.

- In the case of performance judged to be exemplary by the chair, the results shall be documented for university award consideration. Documentation of such performance shall also be forwarded by the chair to the dean, the provost, and the chancellor for appropriate recognition.

- In the case of performance judged to be deficient by the chair, the chair shall forward to the faculty member a copy of the evaluation by the deadline set by the provost. Within ten working days of receipt of the evaluation or within ten working days following the denial of an appeal of the finding of deficient, the chair and faculty member shall meet and, in consultation, begin to create a development plan. The process of creating a development plan and the procedure for appealing a finding of deficient or a finding of non-compliance with a development plan are fully described in the Post-Tenure Review policy adopted by the Faculty Senate. In the case of a finding of deficient, it is imperative that the faculty member consult this policy found at http://uncw.edu/fac_handbook/employment/evaluation/post_ten_review.htm_

Attachments: Departmental Post Tenure Review Report template
Senate Post-Tenure Review Policy
University of North Carolina at Wilmington
Mathematics and Statistics Department
Post-Tenure Review Report

Name______________________

Rank______________________

Most recent review event and date______________________ Period under review_______

Department Chair Provides:
• SPOT summaries from Institutional Research
• Peer classroom evaluation summaries.
• Annual evaluation summaries.

Faculty Member Summarizes:
1. COURSES TAUGHT (List classes taught by semester, most recent first.)

2. THESES DIRECTED (List the student’s name, thesis title, and date of graduation. Include theses in progress.)

3. PUBLICATIONS (List only publications that have been published, accepted or submitted during the review period. List each publication only once, most recent first, indicating its current status and whether it was refereed. Comment on work in progress - limit to one page.)

4. PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS (List presentations to off-campus professional audiences with title, event, date, and place.)

5. SERVICE ACTIVITIES

6. FACULTY STATEMENT (any additional activities may be included here; optional, limited to one page.)
Post-tenure review

The policy was adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1998 and implemented during the 1998-99 academic year. It was revised by the Senate in 2001 for 2002-03 implementation.
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Introduction

Post-tenure review (PTR) is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality. The purpose of PTR is to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by recognizing and rewarding exemplary faculty performance; providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of faculty found deficient; and 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.

Just as an institution's policies governing the award of tenure must reflect the institution's mission, policies for PTR must also be guided by institutional mission, and the performance of each tenured faculty member must be evaluated in the context of the mission of the individual's college or school and department. While PTR is not a revalidation of the award of tenure, many characteristics of an institution's tenure policies remain relevant in judging the performance of tenured faculty. UNCW's [Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Award of Tenure](https://example.com/criteria) states:

The primary concern of the university is teaching its students. Thus teaching effectiveness is the primary criterion for reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

It follows that teaching effectiveness should be the primary evaluation area in the post-tenure review of a faculty member. The "Criteria" also states:
It is essential also that the university faculty be composed of individuals with a variety of strengths. Heterogeneity among faculty in contributions to the university is crucial.... Fixed weightings to be used in determining the relative importance of these different areas should be avoided in making reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions.

The most effective way to ensure that the importance of individual contributions is appropriately recognized, and to account for differences in the nature and mission of varied academic disciplines, is to base the post-tenure evaluation on peer review by departmental colleagues, and to have the department chair determine the quality of faculty performance and, when necessary, to guide the creation and implementation of a development plan. To effectively link the annual evaluation of faculty to PTR, the post-tenure review must take place at the departmental level, as do the annual evaluations.

PTR is an addition to an already elaborate process of faculty evaluation. Care must be taken to focus on the new features of evaluation that PTR brings, and to avoid redundancy of evaluation. The objective of PTR is to identify and reward exemplary faculty performance, and to identify and correct deficient faculty performance. PTR provides a new opportunity to identify sustained exemplary performance of faculty that may not be recognized over a period of only one year, and for which there has heretofore been no means of recognition. PTR provides a new constructive mechanism to correct deficient performance of faculty, in the rare event that it occurs. PTR should not be used to suggest ways that competent, conscientious faculty may merely improve their satisfactory performance—annual reviews already have that function.

---

**Faculty to be reviewed**

PTR is required of all tenured faculty whose primary responsibilities (50% or more) are teaching and/or research and/or service. Tenured librarians shall be subject to PTR. For each chair or administrator within a college or school[^1], the dean shall determine whether that person meets the criteria for mandatory review.

[^1]: For the purposes of this policy, the term "college or school" shall include Randall Library, and the term "dean" shall include the University Librarian.

---

**Timetable**

Faculty of whom PTR is required must undergo a review no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent of these review events:

- award of tenure at UNCW
- departmental recommendation for promotion
- prior post-tenure review
- other equivalent comprehensive review of performance at UNCW
- return to faculty status following administrative service of two years or more

Exceptions shall be made in the following cases:
1. A period when a faculty member is on leave from professional duties shall not be included as part of the five years between mandatory review events; in such cases, the maximum interval shall be extended accordingly.

2. A period when a faculty member has reassigned time shall be included as part of the five years between mandatory review events; however, a faculty member who is temporarily assigned to duties away from the Wilmington area during the period when a review is required shall undergo review during the academic year when duties in the area are resumed.

3. PTR is not required of a faculty member who has officially set an irrevocable retirement or resignation within the next 12 months.

A tenured faculty member may elect to undergo PTR during any academic year. No faculty member shall be compelled to undergo PTR as described in this policy earlier than as required by this timetable.\[^2\] At the beginning of each academic year, each dean shall provide a list of those faculty required to be reviewed during that year.

\[^2\] This restriction applies to post-tenure review and does not limit other currently-existing forms of evaluation; for example, the Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure states, "When circumstances warrant, an evaluation may be initiated by the department chairperson, the appropriate dean, the provost and vice chancellor for Academic Affairs, or the chancellor."

**Procedures**

Performance shall be reviewed for the period since the prior review event or for the preceding five years, whichever period is less. A faculty member being reviewed shall provide a succinct report, for the period being evaluated, on professional activities in teaching, research/artistic achievement, and service. Each department shall establish the format for the report, except that it must include (where applicable) courses taught, theses directed, and all evaluations of teaching; publications, performances, and presentations; service activities; and all annual evaluations for the years under review.

PTR must include peer review of faculty professional performance. Each department shall establish a procedure for peer review, which must include an evaluation by at least three tenured colleagues of the faculty member's record in teaching, research/artistic achievement, and service. Peer reviewers shall present their evaluations in writing as advice to the chair\[^3\], who will then write the evaluation relative to the mission of the university, college/school, and program. The chair's evaluation shall state whether the faculty member's overall professional performance has been satisfactory, exemplary, or deficient. The chair shall provide a copy of the evaluation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The faculty member has the option of attaching a written response. The chair shall forward a list of the peer evaluators, a copy of the evaluation, and the faculty member's response, if any, to the dean for information. The faculty member and chair shall sign the evaluation in acknowledgment of its receipt by the faculty member. In the case of a finding of deficient, the faculty member has the right to appeal the finding on the basis of the four grounds stated to be impermissible (see [Appeal from a finding of deficient or from a finding of non-compliance with a development plan](#) below).

Each year the Provost shall establish deadlines for the completion of the PTR process.
For the purposes of this policy, the term "chair" shall be equivalent to "immediate supervisor" and shall include the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs of the School of Nursing and the University Librarian.

Criteria

Criteria for satisfactory faculty performance are professional competence; conscientious discharge of duties, taking into account distribution of workload as assigned by the department chair; and efforts to improve performance. Criteria for exemplary faculty performance are sustained excellence in teaching, research/artistic achievement, and service; and professional performance that is substantially above expectations and that significantly exceeds the performance of most faculty. Deficient faculty performance is performance that does not meet the criteria for being judged satisfactory, as stated above. Annual evaluations for the period under review shall be given great consideration during PTR; faculty whose annual reviews have indicated satisfactory performance or better during that period shall normally be expected to receive a satisfactory evaluation or better under PTR.

Outcomes

In the case of performance judged to be exemplary, the results shall be documented for university award consideration. Documentation of such performance shall also be forwarded by the chair to the dean, the Provost, and the Chancellor for appropriate recognition.

In the case of performance judged to be deficient, the chair shall forward to the faculty member a copy of the evaluation by the deadline set by the Provost. Within ten working days of receipt of the evaluation or within ten working days following the denial of an appeal of the finding of deficient, the chair and faculty member shall meet and, in consultation, begin to create a development plan. The plan shall include the following:

1. specific strategies and steps designed to lead to improvement,
2. delineation of specific outcomes which constitute improvement,
3. resources to be committed, if any,
4. a specified timeline, not to exceed three years,
5. a statement of the process by which performance under the plan will be evaluated and feedback provided to the faculty member, including a clear specification of who will conduct the evaluation, and
6. a clear statement of consequences should the improvement not occur.

The faculty member and the chair shall sign the development plan, and the chair shall forward a copy to the dean, who must approve any resources to be committed.

A development plan shall not be required of a faculty member who has received a satisfactory review.

In the case of the Library, the plan shall be forwarded to the Provost or Provost’s designee.
Due process

The Code states: "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 a nature as to indicate that the individual is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty" (VI: 603). Due process and the right of appeal as specified in The Code and UNCW’s Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure shall be guaranteed. The outcome of evaluation should be confidential—that is, confined to the appropriate university persons or bodies and the faculty member being evaluated—and released only at the discretion or with the consent of the faculty member.

A faculty member may appeal a finding of deficient, a finding of non-compliance with a development plan, or the imposition of sanctions other than discharge, suspension from employment, or diminishment in rank to the Faculty Professional Relations Committee (FPRC). A faculty member may appeal the imposition of serious sanctions (discharge, suspension from employment, or diminishment in rank) to the Hearings Panel as specified in Chapter VI of The Code.

Appeal from a finding of deficient or from a finding of non-compliance with a development plan

A faculty member may appeal a finding of deficient or a finding of non-compliance with a development plan, by letter to the chair of the Faculty Professional Relations Committee, within ten working days after the faculty member has received the written evaluation from the department chair. The FPRC reviews the request of the faculty member in order to determine whether the decision may have been based upon any of the grounds stated to be impermissible. A finding of deficient or a finding of non-compliance with a development plan may not be based upon (1) the faculty member's exercise of rights guaranteed by either the First Amendment to the United States Constitution or Article I of the North Carolina Constitution; (2) discrimination based upon the faculty member's personal characteristics, such as age, color, handicap, national origin, race, religion, sex, or sexual orientation; (3) personal malice; or (4) procedural irregularities that cast reasonable doubt upon the validity of the decision and which may include but are not limited to the following:

- a process not in compliance with the policies and procedures set forth in this document
- a process not in compliance with the policies and procedures set forth in the departmental PTR policy
- a process not in compliance with existing policies of faculty evaluation published in The Code or the UNCW Faculty Handbook
- a finding of deficient that is inconsistent with the faculty member's annual evaluations for the period under review, unless reasons for the finding are both extraordinary and also clearly and reasonably articulated in writing
- a finding of non-compliance with a development plan that is inconsistent with the terms stated in the development plan.
Should the committee determine that the evaluation may have been based upon any of these impermissible grounds, it grants the faculty member a hearing and either sustains the appeal or else confirms the previous evaluation. The committee’s decision is a recommendation to the Provost or the Provost's designee, whose decision is final.

[5] In a department that has established in its post-tenure review policy an internal appeals process, the faculty member must first use that process before using university-level processes. The faculty member must initiate the university-level action within ten working days following a denial of the departmental appeal.

Failure to agree on a development plan

If a mutually acceptable plan is not reached within one month after the initial meeting, the currently existing mediation process of the Faculty Professional Relations Committee shall be utilized. If a mediated settlement cannot be achieved under the auspices of the FPRC, the FPRC shall advise adjustment by the dean[6] as the committee considers appropriate and the dean[6] shall act as arbitrator in the development of a plan.

[6] The Provost or the Provost's designee shall assume this role for the Library.

Policy review and revision

UNCW’s PTR policy was initially developed by a committee of faculty, adopted by the Faculty Senate in the spring of 1998, and approved by the Board of Trustees of UNCW and by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina. The first academic year of its implementation was 1998-99.

Revisions in this PTR policy may be initiated at any time by action of the Faculty Senate. Non-editorial revisions require approval by both the Board of Trustees of UNCW and by the Board of Governors. Such revisions shall become effective in the academic year following their approval by the Board of Governors.

The policy was revised by the Senate in the fall of 2001 with implementation during the 2002-03 academic year.