

SOD Post Tenure Review Policy FY2015-16.pdf

POLICY FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

School of Dentistry

1 April 2015 (updated)

Background

The Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina approved a Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty that became effective 1 September 1998. Subsequently, each constituent campus developed its own policy for review of tenured faculty that was consistent with the Trustee Policy. The units within each campus developed applicable policies.

Purpose

Post-tenure review is a systematic process for the periodic, comprehensive review of the performance of all faculty members having permanent tenure and whose primary duties are teaching, research and service. The goals of post-tenure review are to promote faculty development, ensure faculty productivity and provide accountability. The post-tenure review process should respect the basic principles of academic freedom. Post-tenure review does not abrogate, in any way, the due process criteria or procedures for dismissal or other disciplinary action established under the *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure*. The policies and procedures incorporate the basic principles of the policies established by the Board of Governors in the UNC Policy Manual, Chapter 400-Academic Programs, 400.3-Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina, 4003.3-Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, 400.3.3.1(G)-Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty (<http://www.northcarolina.edu/content.php/legal/policymanual/contents.htm>). This information was formerly identified in Board of Governors Memorandum #371.

More specifically, in the School of Dentistry, post-tenure review process serves as an additional means of fostering the School's mission of excellence in teaching, research, service and patient care. To achieve this purpose, the review process assists individual faculty members in their ongoing professional development as they strive to enhance their skills as teachers, their accomplishments as scholars, and their contributions to the profession and the public. The review process is intended to foster constructive dialogue between colleagues that will be characterized by fairness, mutual respect, a desire to learn, open-mindedness, and appreciation for the importance of academic freedom. The process of review also will serve to enhance a sense of accountability within the School of Dentistry and the University.

Policy

Each faculty member is subject to post-tenure review at least once every five years following the conferral of permanent tenure. Reviews must examine all aspects of a faculty member's academic performance and should be flexible enough to acknowledge

different expectations in various disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers. The review will be conducted by the Post-Tenure Review Committee which is a School of Dentistry standing committee whose membership is composed of faculty peers. The members are appointed by the Dean upon recommendations from the faculty. Comprehensive evaluations conducted for other purposes, such as a review for promotion, may be substituted for, or combined with, post-tenure review. A review may be delayed for compelling reasons approved by the Provost. Human Resources shall provide information to the Dean regarding faculty members due for a post-tenure review during the upcoming year and the Dean's office shall notify a faculty member at least six months in advance of an upcoming post-tenure review.

Principles

The faculty believes that the post-tenure review process should be as simple, straightforward, fair, functional and flexible as possible, so that the purposes of the review process are achieved in both an effective and time-efficient fashion. All matters relating to post-tenure review will be regarded as confidential. All faculty members who participate as members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee or otherwise advise on individual cases will take seriously their obligation to abide by this requirement. Each faculty member who is to undergo review in a given year will take an active role in the post-tenure review process by assisting with planning, preparing relevant background information, engaging in constructive dialogue with colleagues and the Dean, and if needed, undertaking a development plan to address deficiencies in performance. The Post-Tenure Review Committee of the School of Dentistry will consist of three tenured faculty members appointed by the Dean for a three-year term, one of whom will serve as Chair. The Committee shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Dean.

The system of post-tenure review will complement 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 evaluations, or personnel actions taken pursuant to University policies on promotion and tenure and other matters relating to faculty conduct and performance. To eliminate redundancy of effort, post-tenure review will be waived in cases when the review is concomitant with a scheduled review for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, or with an administrative review for reappointment of an administrator.

Process

In September of each year, the Dean (or his/her designee) will communicate to the Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee the names of the faculty to be reviewed. The Dean's designee will then contact the faculty member(s) and inform them of the process. The review process will be conducted in a way that provides the faculty member being reviewed, the Dean, and the members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee with relevant information concerning the faculty member's accomplishments and plans in the areas of teaching, research, service and patient care. Information to be considered will include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Self-Assessment by Faculty Member. The faculty member being reviewed will prepare a brief written self-assessment (not to exceed two typewritten pages) indicating his or her accomplishments during the past five years (and, in the case of the initial review, his or her accomplishments during the period since tenure or promotion to full professor). A one page prospective list of academic goals for the upcoming five years also will be provided.

2. Background Information. The faculty member also will prepare a file that includes a current curriculum vitae and a summary of teaching evaluations (that have been maintained on file by both the faculty member and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs). In some cases, additional information may be requested for documentation of effort including a “teaching portfolio”, scholarly work completed since the last review (with an indication of the three most important works); information concerning significant professional and public service; and other relevant materials. These materials are not required for all reviews, and will only be requested if questions exist in one or more areas of effort.

Consultation Between Faculty Member Being Reviewed and the Post-Tenure Review Committee. A brief interview with the Post-Tenure Review Committee will be scheduled with the faculty member being reviewed. This meeting is intended to allow the faculty member to discuss accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, service, and patient care. Additionally, it affords the faculty the opportunity to comment on work load, deployment, and other factors or circumstances that may have had a bearing on performance. It also allows the faculty an opportunity to express their thoughts on ways in which the School could assist them in their professional development.

Consultation Between the Chair or Administrative Supervisor of the Faculty Member Being Reviewed and the Post-Tenure Review Committee. A brief interview with the Post-Tenure Review Committee will be scheduled with the faculty member’s Department Chair or Administrative Supervisor. The intent of this interview is to allow the Chair or Supervisor to provide salient insights regarding the faculty member’s performance and any recommendations for a development plan, should one be indicated. In the case of joint appointments, both supervising Chairs or administrators will be invited to provide input.

Determination of Overall Performance. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will advise the faculty member being reviewed and the Dean whether it believes that the faculty member being reviewed is performing at a superior level, satisfactory level or has substantial deficiencies in performance that need to be addressed through creation of a development plan. The Dean will share this information with the faculty member’s Chair or Administrative supervisor. The Committee also may provide informal peer advice and recommendations to the faculty member being reviewed and the Dean. The Dean also will provide an evaluation of the faculty member.

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.

Establishing and Monitoring of Development Plan. In the event that the Post-Tenure Review Committee concludes that the faculty member being reviewed has a record of overall performance that reflects substantial deficiencies that need to be addressed, and has recommended the establishment of a development plan, the Dean and the faculty member being reviewed will meet to generate a development plan designed to assist the faculty member in eliminating deficiencies in performance. This plan will be formulated in consultation with the faculty member's Chair or Administrative supervisor. The development plan will identify clear goals, indicators of goal attainment, a clear and reasonable time frame for the completion of goals, any resources or support needed to facilitate the plan, and a statement of consequences if the goals are not reached. The performance of a faculty member who has been found to have substantial deficiencies in overall performance and who is working on completion of a development plan will be reviewed by the Dean in consultation with the faculty member's Chair or Administrative supervisor on an annual basis for a period of up to three years until such time as substantial deficiencies have been remedied. In the event that substantial deficiencies in performance continue to exist at the end of the three-year period, the Dean will consider whether action should be initiated pursuant to the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure or other steps taken to address the substantial deficiencies in performance.

Maintenance of Confidential Written Record. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will develop a brief written summary of the Committee's conclusions and will share that summary with the Dean and the faculty member being reviewed for comment. The faculty member being reviewed may submit written comments to the Committee and the Dean in response to the written summary. The Dean will maintain the Committee's written summary and the response, if any, by the faculty member being reviewed as part of that faculty member's confidential personnel file, along with all background information and other materials used in connection with the review.

Appeals and Reports to the Provost

Appeals of Finding of Substantial Deficiencies and Development Plans. Faculty members found by the Post-Tenure Review Committee and the Dean to have substantial deficiencies in performance and for whom a development plan is 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 Dean including such findings and development plan. Appeal rights are as provided for in the University's policy on post-tenure review.

Annual Reports Filed with Provost. As provided in the University policy on post-tenure review 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 reasons for delay).