

SILS Post Tenure Review Policy FY2015-16.pdf

I. Post tenure review policy

Statement of Purpose. The School of Information and Library Science educates innovative and responsible thinkers who will lead the information professions; discovers principles and impacts of information; creates systems, techniques, and policies to advance information processes and services; and promotes information creation, access, use, management, and stewardship to improve the quality of life for diverse local, national, and global communities. The purpose of the School's post-tenure review policy is to ensure that faculty continue to support this mission of the School effectively after tenure is granted. Throughout their careers, members of the faculty of the School of Information and Library Science are expected to maintain the School's standards of excellence in teaching, research, and service as described in the School's *Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure* documentation.

Cycle of Review. The number of faculty members to be reviewed in any given year will be approximately 20% of the number of tenured faculty members, excluding the Dean. This approximate 20% will include those tenured faculty being evaluated for promotion that year as well as tenured faculty not seeking promotion during that year. All tenured faculty members other than the Dean will be reviewed at least every five years.

Relation to Other Forms of Review. The system of post-tenure review will supplement, rather than substitute for, other systems of review, including those relating to tenure and promotion, annual feedback in years prior to tenure, appointment to distinguished chairs, salary determinations, yearly evaluation meetings with the Dean, or personnel actions taken pursuant to University policies on tenure and promotion and other matters relating to faculty conduct and performance.

General Principles. The faculty believes that the post-tenure review should be as simple, straightforward, fair, functional, constructive, and flexible as possible, so that the purposes of the review process are achieved in both an effective and time-efficient fashion.

Obligation of Confidentiality. All matters related to post-tenure review, as with all personnel matters, will be treated as confidential in nature and those involved with evaluating faculty will take seriously their obligation to abide by this requirement.

Participation by Faculty Member being Reviewed. A faculty member who is being reviewed during a given semester will take an active role in the post-tenure review process by assisting with planning, preparing relevant background information, engaging in constructive dialogue with the Dean and colleagues, and undertaking a Development Plan if needed to address deficiencies in performance.

Process. Before the beginning of the semester in which evaluation takes places, the Dean will notify the faculty member that the evaluation is scheduled for the coming semester and will inform the faculty member which materials will be needed to be submitted by the faculty member and the dates for submission. All materials will be submitted to the Dean, who will forward appropriate materials to the Personnel Committee. The

Personnel Committee will obtain additional appropriate materials, such as letters from faculty and students addressing ways in which the person being evaluated supports the goals of the School as described in the School's Mission statement. A letter making recommendations will be submitted by the Personnel Committee to the faculty member and the Dean before the end of the semester. The faculty member being reviewed must be given an opportunity to provide a written response to the report of the Personnel Committee. The Dean will make constructive recommendations to the candidate based on the Review and any response by the faculty member, both in a meeting and in writing, and a Development Plan will be developed addressing those significant deficiencies needing to be remedied.

Composition of the Evaluation Committee: The School's Personnel Committee will serve as the evaluation committee for the post-tenure faculty member review process.

Determination Regarding Overall Performance. The Personnel Committee will indicate to the Dean those areas in which the faculty member is satisfactory and those areas in which substantial improvement is considered desirable. Specific constructive recommendations may be made to the Dean. The Dean will then make her or his desired recommendations to the faculty member. If a Development Plan is required by the Dean, the necessity will be communicated to the faculty member at this time.

Recognition of Outstanding Performance. In instances in which the faculty member being reviewed is found to have evidenced outstanding overall performance, the Dean will endeavor to recognize that performance through appropriate forms of positive recognition, including but not limited to nominations for awards.

Establishment and Monitoring of a Development Plan. If the Dean requires that the faculty member produce a Development Plan, the faculty member will do so during the month after the necessity for its development is communicated to the faculty member. Constructive comments from the Dean should be sought during its development and the plan must meet with the Dean's approval. The plan will contain clear behavioral goals, indicators of goal attainment, and a reasonable time frame for the completion of goals. The Dean will include or attach a statement of the consequences if the goals are not reached. Those faculty who have been found to have significant deficiencies and who are working on achieving the goals specified in the Development Plan will be evaluated yearly by the Dean for up to three years or until the deficiency has been removed. If the deficiencies continue to exist at the end of three years, the Dean will consider whether action should be initiated pursuant to the *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure*, or other steps may be taken to address the substantial deficiencies in performance.

In the case of a faculty member who fails to complete a development plan successfully and whose performance continues to be deficient, the unit head should notify the dean, who will consider whether grounds for dismissal or other disciplinary action exist under the Trustees Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure. Dismissal or severe sanction may be imposed only in accordance with and on the grounds stated in the Trustees Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure.

Faculty members may grieve matters related to post-tenure review to the Faculty Grievance Committee under Section 607 of the Code of the University of North Carolina during their term of employment.

Background Information. The faculty member will prepare a file that contains a current curriculum vitae, student teaching evaluations, one letter from a peer teaching observer describing the results of a peer teaching observation from among the last 3 peer teaching observations, copies of all publications during the last 5 years, and optionally teaching materials currently used in classes and publications from before the preceding 5 years, as well as any other relevant material that the faculty member may choose to submit. The faculty member being evaluated will supply a written statement describing their past and planned teaching, research, service, and activities. Faculty colleagues will be invited to comment on the information contained in the material submitted. Comments from current students will be solicited. Letters will be requested by the Dean from distinguished scholars from outside the School, critiquing the scholarship of the faculty member being evaluated, at the discretion of either the faculty member being evaluated or the Dean.

Peer Observation of Classes. Peer observation of classes will be conducted in order to gain insights about the faculty member's teaching. Normally, such observations will be conducted before the semester in which the candidate is evaluated. Observations will be conducted in accordance with the School's guidelines, as described in the Guidelines for Peer Observations.

Appeals of Findings of Substantial Deficiencies and Development Plans. Faculty members who have been found to show a substantial deficiency and for whom a Development Plan has been recommended may appeal within 30 days of receiving a final letter from the Dean including such findings. Appeal rights are as provided for in the University's policy on post-tenure review.

Annual Reports Filed with Provost. As provided for in the University policy on post-tenure view, the Dean will file annual reports to the Office of the Provost specifying the names of faculty members reviewed during the previous year, the names of faculty members for whom a Development Plan was recommended and established, and the names of faculty members who were subject to review in that year but for whom a delay was requested (along with the reason for the delay).

Procedure for Requesting a Post Tenure Review Delay. Requests to delay an upcoming post tenure review should be submitted to the faculty member's unit head in advance to ensure timely school processing of the request.

- Requests must be in writing and specify the compelling reason(s) for the request to delay the review.
- Requests must include a written justification and be approved by the Dean (or his/her designee).

- Approved requests are then submitted to the Executive Vice-Provost and Chief International Officer for review and approval. Once the request is reviewed, a written communication will be sent from the Provost's Office to the faculty member, the unit head and the next higher level administrative officer indicating whether the request has been approved.
- If the request is approved, the School must then complete an electronic action in the existing system, with the Provost's letter of approval attached, to finalize the change to the Post Tenure Review date.