VIII. POST-TENURE REVIEW GUIDELINES

A. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of post-tenure review at UNC-Chapel Hill and the Gillings School of Global Public Health is to contribute to achieving the School and University missions of educational excellence. The review process for all faculty members having permanent tenure should assist them in their ongoing professional development, including efforts to enhance their skills as teachers, their accomplishments as scholars, and their contributions to the profession and the public. Should performance deficiencies be found, the process should constructively address these in specific ways to aid the faculty member in achieving productive careers at the School.

B. GENERAL POLICY

The SPH policy and process will conform to the Framework for Implementation of the Trustee Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty, revision 9/1/98, or subsequent revisions of this document. Each tenured faculty member must be reviewed at least once every five (5) years following conferral of permanent tenure. More frequent review may occur at discretion of department chairs. Review must examine all aspects of faculty activities and performance. Criteria for evaluation will be determined by each department, but must conform to those documented in this manual.

The review process must involve faculty peers and be conducted by at least three persons who constitute the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee. Comprehensive evaluations conducted for other purposes, such as promotion or reappointment, may be substituted for or combined with post-tenure review. A review may be delayed for compelling reasons approved by dean and provost.

C. EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS

All faculty members are expected throughout their careers to maintain standards of excellence and integrity in teaching, scholarship, and service (professional and faculty engagement) as stated in School’s tenure and promotion policy. Evaluation of performance will take into account changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers. Faculty members may expect nurture, aid, and support by more senior faculty and the department chair toward the development and realization of productive and successful careers at the Gillings School of Global Public Health.

D. POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURE

1. Cycle of review, notice, and participation of faculty
   a. The number of faculty members to be reviewed in any given year will be approximately 20% of tenured faculty in departments.
b. All faculty members who are to undergo review will be advised by
department chairs of such reviews at least six (6) months in advance.
c. All faculty members who are to undergo review in a given year will take active
roles in the post-tenure review process by assisting with planning, preparing
relevant background information, engaging in constructive dialogues with
colleagues and the department chair and participating in creation of a
development plan, if needed, to address deficiencies in performance.

2. Composition of Post-Tenure Review Committees
a. Department chairs shall call for either ad-hoc committees each year or a
standing committee, called Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee. The
Committee must include at least three tenured faculty members to oversee
post-tenure reviews. There is no requirement that they all be from the faculty
member’s department.
b. Dean’s Office manages chairs’ reviews.

3. Information considered during review process
a. The review process will be conducted in a way that provides department chair
and members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee relevant information
concerning the faculty member’s accomplishments over the past 5 years and
their upcoming 5 year goals and plans in teaching, research, practice and service
(professional and faculty engagement) in relation to mission of the department,
School, and University.

b. Faculty members must provide the Post-Tenure Review Committee:
   i. Current curriculum vitae;
   ii. Teaching portfolio (with results from course evaluations)
   iii. Summary of professional service and faculty engagement activities;
   iv. Goals or plans for the next 5 years that include milestones that are
      aligned with department’s annual performance expectations;
   v. Examples of scholarly work completed since the last review; and
   vi. Other relevant materials.

c. Department chair may also provide the PTR Committee with additional
information that may be pertinent, including information developed during
periodic merit reviews and information relating to the faculty member’s
ongoing work within the department or School.

4. Consultation between faculty members being reviewed, Post-Tenure Review
Committees, and department chairs
a. As appropriate, faculty members being reviewed may meet with Post-
Tenure Review Committees and department chairs to discuss teaching,
 scholarship, service, and other accomplishments as well as their future plans.
b. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will do the following.
   i. Use all evidence provided by the faculty member being reviewed and
department chair in evaluating performance, as outlined in #1-
3, above;
   ii. Provide written summary (to faculty member and department
chair) with assessment of at least three categories and overall
performance and clearly specify if s/he meets, exceeds or does not
meet expectations, any recommendations for improvement, and/or any substantial deficiencies in performance that should be addressed through creation of a development plan; and

iii. Also may provide informal peer advice and recommendations to faculty member being reviewed and to department chair.

c. Faculty members being reviewed must be permitted to provide written responses to Committee reports. Based on such responses, department chair may ask the Committee to re-examine its recommendations.

d. The department chair will review the PTR Committee’s report, the faculty member's response (if any) and applicable materials and provide his/her written review to be submitted to the Dean and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

e. The dean will also conduct an evaluative review of the information provided.

5. Recognition of outstanding performance

a. When faculty members being reviewed are considered outstanding in overall performance, department chairs should recognize them.

6. Establishment and monitoring of development plan

a. If Post-Tenure Review Committee concludes faculty member being reviewed has a record of overall performance that reflects substantial deficiencies and has recommended a development plan, department chair and faculty member being reviewed will meet to construct plan.

b. Faculty development plans are individualized and flexible, taking into account the faculty member’s intellectual interests, abilities, and career stage, as well as department needs.

c. Development plans will include clear goals, indicators of goal attainment, a clear and reasonable time frame for completion of goals, and a statement of consequences if goals are not reached.

d. Faculty members completing development plans will be reviewed by department chairs on an annual basis for up to three (3) years until such time as substantial deficiencies have been remedied or other actions have been taken.

e. Department chairs shall acknowledge in writing faculty members’ clear improvement or successful completion of development plans.

f. In the event that substantial deficiencies in performance continue at the end of three-year period, department chairs will notify the faculty member in writing and make recommendation to the dean regarding any remedial or disciplinary actions.

g. The department chair and dean will consider whether action, which may include revoking tenure, should be initiated pursuant to the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure or other steps taken to address substantial deficiencies in performance.

7. Record Keeping

a. Departmental post-tenure review procedures, to be reviewed periodically, will be filed with the Dean.

b. Chairs will maintain a list of faculty members reviewed each year, a record of the completed reviews and responses to the reviews, the names of the faculty
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members for whom development plans were recommended, and a copy of the
development plans.

8. Procedure for Requesting a Post Tenure Review Delay
   a. Requests should be delivered to the department chair in advance to ensure
timely processing and must be in writing, specifying the compelling reason(s) for
the delay.
   b. Requests must include a written justification from the department chair and be
approved by the Dean.
   c. Approved requests are then submitted to the Executive Vice-Provost and Chief
International Officer for review and approval. Once reviewed, a written
communication will be sent to the faculty member, department chair and dean.
   d. If approved, an action must be submitted in PeopleSoft with the Provost’s letter
attached, to finalize the change to the Post Tenure Review Date.

E. REPORTS AND APPEALS TO THE DEAN

1. Annual reports filed with dean
   a. Human Resources at the SPH will provide a yearly report that lists all faculty
members reviewed during prior year, including outcomes for each individual.

2. Appeals for findings of substantial deficiencies and development plans
   a. Faculty members found by Post-Tenure Review Committees and department
chairs to have substantial deficiencies in performance and for whom
development plans are established may appeal the finding of
substantial deficiency or the terms of the development plan within 30 days of
receiving a final letter from the department chair, including such
findings.
   b. The appeal is to the dean, who may consult with UNC Counsel and the
Provost’s Office. The decision shall be final.

F. RECORDS AND CONFIDENTIALITY

1. Maintenance of written records
   a. Department chairs will maintain the Committee’s review summary, the
response, if any, by the faculty member being reviewed, the faculty member’s confidential personnel file, along with all background
information, other materials used in connection with the review, and a
development plan, if required.

2. Obligation of confidentiality
   a. All matters relating to post-tenure reviews are confidential.
   b. All those who participate as members of Post-Tenure Review Committees or
who otherwise advise on individual cases should be advised of their obligations
to abide by this requirement.