

**ANNUAL AND POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY FOR FACULTY  
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO**

(Approved by the Faculty Senate, September 2, 1998)  
(Approved by the Board of Trustees, September 4, 1998)  
(Approved by the Board of Governors, September 11, 1998)

(Amended by the Faculty Senate, November 30, 2005)  
(Amended by the Board of Trustees, April 5, 2006)

(Amended by the Faculty Senate, September 3, 2008)  
(Approved by the Board of Trustees, September 18, 2008)  
(Approved by the Board of Governors, September 18, 2009)

(Approved by the Faculty Senate, October 5, 2011)  
(Approved by the Board of Trustees, February 16, 2012)  
(Approved by the General Administration, May 21, 2012)

(Approved by the Faculty Senate, April 1, 2015)  
(Approved by the Board of Trustees, May 7, 2015)  
(Approved by the General Administration, August 4, 2015)

**Non-substantive revision to Annual Review practices, 4/25/2018**

---

**I. DEFINITIONS, PURPOSE, AND APPLICABILITY**

- A. Annual review is a periodic (annual) evaluation of faculty performance intended to promote faculty vitality.
- B. Post-tenure review is “a comprehensive, formal periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality.”<sup>1</sup>
- C. The purposes of annual and post-tenure reviews are to:<sup>2</sup>
  - 1. Sustain and facilitate excellence among tenured faculty by recognizing, encouraging, and rewarding faculty performance.
  - 2. Foster faculty development by evaluating all aspects of professional performance, by acknowledging progress in specific areas, and by identifying specific activities that can be undertaken if improvement is needed.
- D. This policy pertains to benefits-earning faculty only (3/4-time or greater). Non-tenure-track faculty who teach two or fewer courses per semester, sometimes referred to as temporary faculty, are minimally expected to receive performance review via student evaluations of each course.
- E. Annual and post-tenure reviews of benefits-earning faculty shall evaluate all aspects of the professional performance of faculty, whose primary responsibilities are teaching, and/or research, and/or service. If faculty responsibilities are primarily only in one or two of these areas, the annual and post-tenure review and resulting recommendations should take this allocation of responsibilities into account.<sup>3</sup>
- F. Department heads/chairs are exempt from post-tenure review.

---

<sup>1</sup> UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G]

<sup>2</sup> UNC Policy Manual, Sections 400.3.3., and 400.3.3.1[G]

<sup>3</sup> UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 5 (for references to Post-Tenure Review)

- G. Annual reviews are related to promotion and tenure reviews because reviews for promotion and tenure must reflect the feedback that the candidate has received in his or her annual reviews<sup>4</sup> (see Section III.G, below).
- H. Post-tenure reviews are separate from reviews for faculty promotion and/or tenure (except as specified in Section IV.C. of this policy).

## II. POLICIES GOVERNING BOTH ANNUAL AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

- A. The primary locus of both annual and post-tenure reviews is the department, though the units<sup>5</sup> may establish procedures that govern both types of reviews as long as these procedures do not violate university policies. The department head/chair has the responsibility of carrying out the reviews, although the reviews of tenure-track and tenured faculty members must significantly involve peers in a form that is recorded in the department's instrument of governance<sup>6</sup> (see Section IV. F., below)<sup>7</sup>. If peer review involves a faculty committee, the department head/chair shall not be a member of the committee. Disagreements between recommendations by the department head/chair and the faculty member's peers will be resolved by the dean as part of his or her evaluative review,<sup>8</sup> so that the faculty member receives a single rating.
- B. The responsibility for developing criteria for the evaluation of faculty performance rests with the departments, but the criteria for the review of tenure-track and tenured faculty must be based on those established in the *University Wide Evaluation Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure* (the *Guidelines*). The units may provide departments with direction on the establishment of evaluation criteria, as long as these directions are consistent with the *Guidelines*.
- C. Feedback provided to faculty members during both annual and post-tenure reviews must be given on the appropriate review form (*Annual Review Form* or *Post-Tenure Review Form*) provided by the Provost's Office. The evaluation categories used on these forms must be "excellent" (exceeds expectations), "good" (meets expectations) and "unsatisfactory" (does not meet expectations).
- D. The faculty member being reviewed must receive written feedback as part of his or her review, and must be given an opportunity to respond formally to the review in writing. This response is attached to the review and becomes a formal part of the review.
- E. The reviews, including the faculty member's response (if any), must be completed by the end of the academic year in which they are scheduled.
- F. All annual and post-tenure review policies must respect the basic principles of academic freedom including the full freedom, within the law, of inquiry, discourse, teaching, research, and publication,<sup>9</sup> and may not abrogate, in any way, the criteria and procedures for due process and for dismissal or other disciplinary action established in accordance with Chapter VI of the *Code of the University of North Carolina*.

---

<sup>4</sup> UNCG *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations*, Sections 2.D.ii. and 4.B.i.d.

<sup>5</sup> For purposes of this Policy, the units are the administrative category above the department. The College of Arts and Sciences, the University Libraries and the professional Schools are all units.

<sup>6</sup> UNCG *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations*, Section 2.D.ii.

<sup>7</sup> Section IV.F. of this policy requires the use of a peer-review committee for post-tenure review. The peer review committee's deliberations are summarized on the Post-Tenure Review Form, which must be submitted to the department head/chair. These procedures are intended to satisfy the requirement, as specified in Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 8, of the UNC Policy Manual, that the department head/chair will consult with the peer-review committee in rendering his/her evaluation.

<sup>8</sup> UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 8

<sup>9</sup> UNC Policy Manual, Section 100.1

### III. ANNUAL REVIEW POLICIES

- A. Annual reviews apply to all benefits-earning faculty members (3/4-time or greater), whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track (including lecturers, Clinical Faculty, Academic Professional Faculty, and other “Special Faculty Members” as defined in the *Code of the University of North Carolina*, Section 610).
- B. Lecturers and other non-tenure-track faculty members are subject to annual review based on procedures that are established by each unit, and which must be recorded in each unit’s instrument of governance. These procedures must be established, and periodically reviewed, with the input of the affected faculty members, or elected representatives of these faculty members.
- C. Reviews of department heads/chairs will be conducted by their dean, and reviews of the deans by the provost.<sup>10</sup> The provost will establish the procedures for these reviews, which must be in general agreement with the policies established here, and must be recorded in the appropriate administrative document.
- D. In addition to the information provided on the *Annual Review Form*, it is incumbent on each department head/chair to provide, to faculty members below the rank of tenured Professor, a clear indication of their progress towards promotion and/or tenure. This feedback must be informed by input from departmental faculty members senior<sup>11</sup> to the person being reviewed, and must be consistent with the policies set down in Section 2 of the *Regulations*, the evaluation criteria in the *University Wide Evaluation Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure*, and the clear and specific criteria specified in unit and departmental promotion and tenure documents.<sup>12</sup>
- E. Prior to departmental review and completion of the *Annual Review Form*, faculty members must supply a record of their annual accomplishments in a format specified by their unit. The reporting method must be consistent within a unit, but may differ between non-tenure track and tenure-track (or tenured) faculty. These reports may, but need not, include a written self-evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments during the year.
- F. Annual feedback from the department head/chair to tenured or tenure track faculty members will include a completed UNCG *Annual Review Form*, written feedback on the year’s achievements, and a summary of the peer review. It may also include recommendations for rewards or improvement, as appropriate.
- G. Annual reviews should provide a means of recognizing, encouraging, and rewarding faculty performance by means of merit pay increases, when funds are available for this purpose.
- H. The *Annual Review Form* must be included in all promotion and tenure portfolios, for all years under consideration. The written feedback (Section III.E.) need not be included as part of the promotion and tenure portfolio, but must be retained in the departmental offices so that they can be reviewed, upon request, by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

### IV. POST-TENURE REVIEW

- A. The cumulative post-tenure review is informed by the annual reports of a tenured faculty member’s work, and includes an additional summative evaluation of all aspects of a faculty member’s professional performance relative to the mission of the department, unit and institution.

---

<sup>10</sup> All further references to reviews of faculty members shall also refer to reviews of department heads and deans, though the locus of the reviews differs for these individuals.

<sup>11</sup> For the purpose of this section, Associate Professors and Professors are senior to Assistant Professors. Professors are senior to Associate Professors.

<sup>12</sup> *UNCG Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations*, Section 2.D.i.

- B. When performance is judged to be excellent, written feedback to the faculty member must include recognition of this performance.<sup>13</sup>
- C. Post-tenure review shall take place no less frequently than every five years following the conferral of tenure.<sup>14</sup> If however, in a given academic year, a tenured faculty member scheduled for post-tenure review is recommended for promotion through the departmental and unit levels of review, then that faculty member will be deemed to have had a successful post-tenure review.<sup>15</sup> There is no need to do a separate cumulative review in addition to the successful promotion-review. Otherwise, the faculty member in question will undergo a [separate] post-tenure review.<sup>16</sup>
- D. At the beginning of a post-tenure review cycle, each tenured faculty member shall set five-year goals in consultation with his or her department head/chair. Disagreements between the faculty member and his/her department head/chair on appropriate five-year goals will be resolved by the dean.
- E. A faculty member's five-year goals may be modified annually, as deemed appropriate by changes in institutional, departmental, or personal circumstances. These goals are used to prepare the faculty member's annual work plans<sup>17</sup> that form the basis for the annual performance evaluations.<sup>18</sup>
- F. Peers must be involved in the post-tenure review process.<sup>19</sup> Peer review must be in the form of a peer review committee whose members are selected by a process agreed upon by the tenured members of the department.<sup>20</sup> The faculty member being reviewed may not select members of the peer review committee.<sup>21</sup>
- G. Because post-tenure review is informed by the performance reported in his or her annual reviews, the faculty member under review shall not be required to provide additional documentation of his or her accomplishments, other than an up-to-date Curriculum Vitae.
- H. UNCG shall, through the provost's office, provide training for all peer-evaluators, including, but not limited to, members of the peer-review committees, department heads/chairs, and deans. This training shall include access to digital training modules prepared and distributed by UNC General Administration, as well as training in campus-specific policies and procedures. The provost will certify that required training has been conducted in his or her annual report to the General Administration.<sup>22</sup>
- I. In his or her annual report to the General Administration, the provost must certify that all required training has been conducted.<sup>23</sup> The provost must also certify that all aspects of the post-tenure review process for that year are in compliance with policy and guidelines.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 11.

<sup>14</sup> A faculty member's date of the conferral of tenure (or promotion, for those already tenured) begins his or her post-tenure review clock. The first post-tenure review must be concluded no later than June 30 of the fifth calendar year following that date. July 1 of the year in which this review is completed begins his or her next post-tenure review cycle, and so on for future post-tenure review cycles.

<sup>15</sup> In such cases, the faculty member who has undergone successful promotion review will not be included in the post-tenure review (PTR) report submitted to General Administration, and no PTR rating (excellent, good, or unsatisfactory) shall be assigned. However, the promoted faculty member must develop five year goals, as described in IV.D.-E.

<sup>16</sup> UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 2. This statement is intended to confirm that, in the event of a promotion review resulting in a decision not to promote, the faculty member under review is subject to the normal PTR process and cycle.

<sup>17</sup> Work plans are prepared annually, and cover one year's work.

<sup>18</sup> UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 6.

<sup>19</sup> In combination with the required use of the Post-Tenure Review Form, this provision is intended to satisfy the requirement, as specified in Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 8, of the UNC Policy Manual, that the department head/chair will consult with the peer-review committee in rendering his/her evaluation.

<sup>20</sup> UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 8

<sup>21</sup> UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 8

<sup>22</sup> UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 9

<sup>23</sup> UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 9

<sup>24</sup> UNC Policy Manual, Section 400.3.3.1[G], item 8

- J. Post-tenure reviews may reward performance by means of special recognition such as:
1. Recommendations for salary increases
  2. Nomination for awards
  3. Research leaves
  4. Revisions of work load
- K. ***Unsatisfactory Post-Tenure Review***. An Unsatisfactory cumulative review may only occur, but is not required, if there have been at least two unsatisfactory annual reviews in the current post-tenure review cycle. In cases of an unsatisfactory cumulative post-tenure review, the following procedures must be followed:
1. The department head/chair shall prepare and sign a statement declaring that the faculty member has received an unsatisfactory post-tenure review. This statement must include a recital of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and a specific description of his or her shortcomings as they relate to these duties, and to the directional goals established as part of the post-tenure review cycle.<sup>25</sup> The statement must document the reasons why the faculty member has been given an unsatisfactory post-tenure review, with reference to specific failings noted in the faculty member's annual reviews. Each of the relevant areas of performance must be addressed. A copy of this statement, along with copies of the faculty member's last five annual reviews, the materials submitted as part of their post-tenure review, and the faculty member's response to the post-tenure review shall be delivered to the dean, with a copy to the faculty member.
  2. The department head/chair must, in consultation with the dean and the individual faculty member, develop a plan for the improvement of the faculty member's performance, and a time line and benchmarks for improvement. The total time allowed for demonstrated improvement (as specified in the improvement plan) may not be less than two years. The resources necessary for the successful implementation of the improvement plan must be clearly stated in the plan, and must be made available to the faculty member during the improvement period. If the faculty member's duties are modified as part of the improvement plan, then the plan should indicate this and take into account the new allocation. The plan must include a written statement of the consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time. If agreement between all parties is reached, the plan will be signed by all three parties. If, following the consultation specified above, the dean determines that agreement cannot be reached, the dean, with the approval of the provost, will sign the improvement plan. A copy of the improvement plan will be delivered to the faculty member and his or her department head/chair, and will become a permanent part of his or her personnel file.
  3. Progress meetings with the department head/chair must occur on at least a semi-annual basis during the improvement period.
  4. If a faculty member fails to meet the designated levels of improvement by the conclusion of the improvement period specified in the plan, then the department head/chair may recommend that the faculty member be subjected to disciplinary action or discharged, as established in *The UNC Policy Manual, Sections 400.3.3 and 400.3.3.1[G]*, and *Section 603 of The Code of the UNC System*.
  5. If the department head/chair recommends that the faculty member be discharged or subjected to other disciplinary action as established in *Section 603 of The Code*, then the following process of review shall be followed.

---

<sup>25</sup> UNC Policy Manual 400.3.3.1[G] , item 11

- a. The head's/chair's recommendation shall be reviewed by a committee consisting of the tenured faculty in his or her department who are senior<sup>26</sup> to the faculty member under review, and a recommendation to accept or reject the head's/chair's suggested course of action prepared.
  - i. A minimum of three faculty members senior to the candidate are normally necessary to assure adequate review. In cases where the dean believes there are too few faculty of the appropriate rank in the candidate's department, the dean will consult with the department head/chair and the candidate on the constitution of the committee. If agreement between these parties is reached, a memorandum of agreement signed by all parties will specify the composition of the review committee. If, following the consultation specified above, the dean determines that agreement cannot be reached, the dean, with the approval of the provost, will specify the composition of the committee. It is the dean's responsibility to ensure that the committee is constituted so as to ensure a fair and independent peer assessment of the candidate's record.
  - ii. Both the faculty member and department head/chair may provide additional documentary evidence to this committee. The committee may also recommend modification of the disciplinary action suggested by the head/chair.
- b. Both the head's/chair's and the committee's reports will be forwarded to the unit Committee on Promotions and Tenure, who will recommend for or against the recommended course of action to the dean. The committee may also recommend modification of the disciplinary action suggested by the head/chair.
- c. The dean will review the recommended course(s) of action suggested by the head/chair, the departmental committee and the unit Committee on Promotion and Tenure, and prepare a recommendation to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure. The dean may recommend modification of the disciplinary action suggested by the head/chair.
- d. The University Committee on Promotions and Tenure will review the dean's suggested action and recommend for or against this action to the provost. The committee may also recommend modification of the disciplinary action suggested by the dean.
- e. The provost will review the lower-level reviews and make a final recommendation to the chancellor. The provost may suggest modifications to the disciplinary action.
- f. Except for the grievance procedures established under *Sections 603 of The Code* of the University of North Carolina, the decision of the Chancellor is final.
- g. The University has the burden of proof in justifying the recommendation in question. The standard of proof to be used throughout the stages of this review is that of clear and convincing evidence (which is the same as the greater preponderance of the evidence).
- h. The recommendations at each level of review shall be forwarded, together with all of the documentary evidence and all of the prior recommendations, to the next level of review.

## V. APPEALS

- A. Faculty members who receive an unfavorable annual or post-tenure review may appeal that review and/or the improvement plan to the Faculty Grievance Committee, according to the procedures of that committee.

---

<sup>26</sup>Associate Professors are senior to Assistant Professors. Professors are senior to Associate Professors. In the case of disciplinary action or dismissal of a Professor, his or her peers shall be other Professors. Untenured faculty members of whatever rank may not be members of the committee.

- B. Faculty members who are subject to serious sanctions or dismissal may appeal this decision to the Due Process Committee according to the policies laid out in *Section 603 of The Code of the University of North Carolina*, as reflected in the *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro*, and in the operating policies of that committee.