

# **FAYETTEVILLE STATE UNIVERSITY**

## **POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Post-Tenure Review (PTR) is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of faculty performance to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality. PTR must be consistent with academic freedom as well as the mission(s) of the university, the college or school, and the department. The purpose of the post-tenure review is to support and encourage academic excellence among tenured faculty by recognizing and rewarding outstanding faculty performance, by providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance for faculty found deficient, and by providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions for those whose performance remains deficient. PTR does not eliminate the participation of any faculty member in the annual review process. The post-tenure policy will be reviewed in its entirety every five years to ensure the soundness and effectiveness of the process.

### **FACULTY TO BE REVIEWED**

Post-tenure review is required of all tenured faculty who teach at least 50% of the standard teaching load. It is required that chairs and other administrators who teach 50% of the time will undergo PTR also.

### **TIMETABLE**

A tenured faculty member may elect to undergo post-tenure review during any academic year but not more than twice in a five year period. Faculty, based on rank, for whom PTR is required must undergo a review not later than the third or fifth academic year following personnel action such as award of tenure, promotion, prior post-tenure review, or return to faculty status following administrative service. Faculty whose rank is assistant or associate professor will be reviewed every three years, and full professors every five years. Performance under review will be limited to the three or five years preceding the post-tenure review. Exceptions will be made in the following cases:

- , Faculty whose most recent personnel action occurred more than three years (for assistant and associate professors) or five years (for full professors) before the start of the policy will undergo a review on the next anniversary of that action.
- , The three or five year period between mandatory actions shall exclude any time during which the faculty member is not teaching. In such cases, the interval will be adjusted based on the time absent from teaching.
- , A faculty member who is temporarily assigned to duties away from the university during the period when a review is required will undergo PTR upon his or her return.
- , A faculty member who plans to retire or enter into the phased retirement program during the year the PTR is scheduled will be exempt.

## **PROCEDURES**

At the beginning of each academic year, each dean shall provide a list of those faculty required to be reviewed during that year. A faculty member being reviewed will provide a written summary covering the previous three or five years of teaching, research/creative activities and service accomplishments. The summary must be accompanied by copies of the Faculty Comprehensive Evaluation forms for the previous three or five years and other documentation which the faculty member and the PTR Committee may deem important to the outcome of the evaluation.

The post-tenure review process must include a written review of faculty professional performance by a Peer Review Committee. The Peer Review Committee shall complete a written report of faculty performance based on the documents provided by the faculty member. The Peer Review Committee will consist of three tenured faculty: one selected from the department by the faculty member being evaluated, one selected from within the university but outside the department by the faculty member being evaluated with agreement by the dean, and one selected from the department by the chairperson. The members of the Peer Review Committee should be of comparable rank, but not less than associate professor when evaluating a full professor; and participate in peer review training.

The Peer Review Committee will select a committee coordinator who will conduct the meetings, provide a copy of the committee's evaluation to the faculty member and meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The faculty member has the option of attaching a written response to the evaluation within ten (10) days. The Peer Review Committee's report will include the faculty member's response, if any, and be submitted to the department chairperson. The peer review

process will be completed no later than April 1 of the academic year with the submission of the results of all reviews to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs through the deans.

### **CRITERIA**

The Peer Review Committee will rate faculty performance as “outstanding,” “very good,” “good,” “satisfactory,” or “needs improvement.” The Peer Review Committee evaluation shall be based on the faculty member’s summary, Faculty Comprehensive Evaluations, the chairperson’s written appraisal of the candidate and other documentation submitted and/or requested from the faculty for review. The evaluation category shall be determined by overall ratings on the peer review instrument as follows:

4.50 and above:	Outstanding
4.25 - 4.49:	Very Good
4.00 - 4.24:	Good
3.26 - 3.99:	Satisfactory
Below 3.26:	Needs Improvement

### **OUTCOMES**

In the case of an “outstanding” review, the report may be documentation for university teaching awards and/or merit pay decisions. A rating of “satisfactory” and above performance concludes the post-tenure review process until the next three or five-year cycle. In the case where the Committee review rating falls into the category

“needs improvement,” the Chair in consultation with the faculty member will create a two-year (for assistant and associate professors) or three-year (for full professors) development plan within 30 days of the review. The Development Plan will include the specific outcomes required, the strategies and timetable for performance improvement, the resources, and support to be provided by the administration. Each plan shall include a statement of sanctions for noncompliance. The sanctions for non-compliance may be discharge or suspension from employment or reduction in rank as stated by *The Code (VI:603)*. The chair will monitor the faculty member’s progress relative to the plan and provide feedback to the faculty member semi-annually. During the implementation of the plan, a faculty member may be exempt from merit pay increases and opportunities to apply for faculty awards or promotion. A copy of the evaluation; the faculty member’s response, if any; and the development plan, if any; will be forwarded to the dean by the department chairperson. The dean must review and approve the development plan.

## **DUE PROCESS**

“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.” (*The Code VI:603*). In its 1993 report entitled *Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina*, the Board of Governors reaffirmed the value of tenure by stating, “The purpose of tenure is to assure faculty members academic freedom and protection against improper abridgments of the freedom of inquiry through teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activities; and to protect the right to publish or otherwise present scholarly work publicly without the threat of political or other sources of confining orthodoxies.” Disciplinary actions for noncompliance with the development plan are limited to those established in Chapter VI of *The Code*. Due process and the right of appeal as specified in *The Code* and the *FSU Tenure Policies and Regulations* shall be guaranteed.

<b>FSU Faculty Senate Approval:</b>	<b>May 14, 1998</b>
<b>FSU Board of Trustees Approval:</b>	<b>June 4, 1998</b>
<b>UNC Board of Governors Approval:</b>	<b>August</b>