Faculty Senate Routing Form
(action/proposal attached)

I. Item Title: **CRC Resolution, Amended: Removal of Post-Tenure Review category from current AA-12 form.**

a) Brief Description:
Beginning in 2008, PTR has appeared as a category on the AA-12 form, calling for items 1-8 and 10 to be completed (as currently seen on attachment B, the 2009 AA-12). This includes departmental committee votes (#7) and a section (#10) for Dean's recommendation and description of action. Neither of these items is stipulated or required in the Handbook section 4.08 for PTR. To reconcile these discrepancies, the CRC recommends amendment of the Post-Tenure Review category on the AA-12 form to accurately reflect mandated PTR process according to the Faculty Handbook. These changes, unless otherwise stated, will be reflected in the 2011-2012 AA-12.

b) Initiated by: _Collegial Review Council ____

II. Faculty Senate Action: ☒ approved ☐ not approved ☐ other date: 10/27/2010

Comments: The Faculty Senate approved this resolution with a paper vote:

Vote: Voice Vote, ☐ Unanimous ☒ Paper Vote, Majority In Favor
☐ Electronic Clicker: 21 Ayes 5 Nays 1 Abstentions

FS Secretary signature: _____ date __11/24/2010_____

III. Provost: ☐ for information
☒ for action.....☐ approved ☐ not approved

Comments: _____

Person responsible for Implementation: Beth Lofquist

Provost signature: _____ date 12.13.10

IV. Chancellor: ☐ for information ☒ RECOGNITION OF RECEIPT
☒ for action.....☐ approved ☐ not approved

Comments: _____

Chancellor signature _____ date 2-2-11

Once finalized copies will be returned to the Provost's representative who will scan and distribute electronically to: Chancellor

CRC Resolution, Amended: Removal of Post-Tenure Review category from current AA-12 form.

The Collegial Review Council was made aware of inconsistencies in the Post-Tenure Review (henceforth PTR) process, regarding procedure as dictated in Faculty Handbook 4.08 (Attachment A) and the review process stated on the current AA-12 form (Attachment B).

The Faculty Handbook 4.08 D states that a faculty member undertaking PTR will submit a CV and the four most recent AFE's as materials for review. Handbook 4.08 E calls for an approved departmental procedure for PTR, which includes evaluations from peers and / or PTR committee and a department head evaluation. Handbook 4.08 G states that these items are passed on to the Dean for review and decision and to the Provost for information. The AA-12 is not included within the PTR process in the current approved handbook.

Beginning in 2008, PTR has appeared as a category on the AA-12 form, calling for items 1-8 and 10 to be completed (as currently seen on attachment B, the 2009 AA-12). This includes departmental committee votes (#7) and a section (#10) for Dean's recommendation and description of action. Neither of these items is stipulated or required in the Handbook section 4.08 for PTR.

Resolution:

To reconcile these discrepancies, the CRC recommends amendment of the Post-Tenure Review category on the AA-12 form to accurately reflect mandated PTR process according to the Faculty Handbook. These changes, unless otherwise stated, will be reflected in the 2011-2012 AA-12.

Faculty members undergoing post-tenure review will complete numbers 1-6, 7b, 8, 10b, and 12b on an amended AA-12 form.

Number 7, Departmental Committee section, will be amended to include 7b for PTR faculty. 7b will include a section for departmental outcomes of PTR decisions, including a rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory for the faculty under review. (Note: omission of departmental vote, currently recorded on the AA-12, will be changed immediately, as this is not stipulated in the Handbook. The satisfactory / unsatisfactory rating will be included in 2011-2012 AA-12).

Number 10, Recommendation of Dean section, will be amended to include 10b for PTR faculty. 10b will allow for a signature of the Dean acknowledging the PTR outcome.

Number 12, Recommendation of Provost section, will be amended to include 12b for PTR faculty. 12b will allow for a signature of the Provost acknowledging the PTR outcome.

The university, when forwarding PTR outcomes to the Office of the President, will acknowledge that "WCU has adopted a satisfactory / unsatisfactory rating for Post-Tenure Review faculty."

ATTACHMENT A:

Faculty Handbook 4.08 Post-Tenure Review

A. Introduction

Post-tenure review (PTR) is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of all tenured faculty. The purpose of this review is to support continuing faculty development, to promote faculty vitality, and to encourage excellence among tenured faculty. This is achieved by recognizing and rewarding faculty performance, offering suggestions to enhance performance, providing a clear plan and timetable for improvement of faculty members whose performance is found less than satisfactory;, and providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions for those whose performance remains deficient. Post-tenure review shall be consistent with the University of North Carolina Board of Governors' policy of giving teaching primary consideration.

B. Faculty to Be Reviewed

PTR is required of all tenured faculty whose primary responsibilities (50% or more) involve teaching, scholarship, and/or service. If faculty responsibilities are primarily only to one or two of these areas, post-tenure review and resulting recommendations should take this allocation of responsibilities into account.

C. Timetable

A tenured faculty member may elect to undergo PTR during any academic year. Faculty for whom PTR is required must undergo a review no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent of any of the following review events: award of tenure or promotion at Western Carolina University, prior post-tenure review, or return to faculty status following administrative service. Exceptions shall be made in the following cases: 1) when on leave from duties, that period shall not be included as part of the five years between mandatory review events and/or 2) when temporarily assigned to duties away from Cullowhee/Asheville during the period of a required review, PTR occurs upon return. In the event of serious illness, childbirth or other compelling reasons, the PTR timetable may be extended by the Provost through a university process established, in consultation with and endorsed by the Faculty Senate, and approved by the Chancellor.

D. Materials to Be Submitted for Review

A faculty member being reviewed will provide the four most recent annual faculty evaluations and a current curriculum vitae (CV).

E. Procedures

Performance to be reviewed is limited to the five years preceding review or to the period subsequent to the prior review event, whichever is less.

The tenured faculty of each department shall establish a procedure for post-tenure review. These procedures must be approved by the dean of the college and the Provost. Each department establishes a PTR committee (approved by the departmental faculty) with at least three tenured departmental colleagues, excluding the department head. Whenever a department finds it impossible to form a committee containing at least three tenured faculty, the matter will be referred to the Provost. The Provost, with the approval of the tenured faculty of the department and the dean of the college, will, by selecting tenured faculty from similar departments, constitute a committee of three tenured faculty for the department. Faculty members being reviewed are not permitted to select a member of the committee. However, this does not preclude such faculty members from voting on committee membership along with their colleagues.

Peer reviewers shall present their written evaluations to the department head. The department head shall provide a copy of this evaluation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The department head shall then append his/her evaluation relative to the mission of the University, college/school/library, and program. The faculty member then has the option of attaching a written response. In the library the role of the department head will be performed by the University Librarian. When a department head is reviewed, the dean shall perform the roles ordinarily performed by the department head.

F. Criteria

Criteria for acceptable faculty performance include professional competence, conscientious execution of duties–taking into account distribution of workload as developed by the department head–and efforts to improve performance. Exemplary faculty performance, as determined by the department, involves sustained excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

G. Outcomes

Post-tenure review outcomes, including a faculty member's response to a negative review, in an academic unit must be reviewed by the Dean. The Dean's decision, along with the Department's review will be sent to the Provost for information.

In the case of a satisfactory review, results are documented for university award and merit pay decisions. In addition, suggestions to enhance performance may be provided.
In the case of an unsatisfactory review, the department head, in consultation with the faculty member, PTR committee, and dean of the faculty member's college, will create a three-year development plan within one month of the review. The plan shall include (1) a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member's assigned duties; (2) specific improvements to be accomplished within three years, (3) resources to be committed to the improvement efforts, and (4) other support provided by the administration. If duties are modified as a result of a less than satisfactory rating, then the development plan should so indicate and take into account the new allocation of responsibilities. The department head and PTR committee will monitor the faculty member's progress relative to the development plan and provide verbal and written feedback to the faculty member semi-annually. The development plan and the written feedback are to be copied to the Dean and the Provost. In the event of serious illness, childbirth or other compelling reasons, the PTR development period may be extended by the Provost through a university process established, in consultation with and endorsed by the Faculty Senate, and approved by the Chancellor.
The plan shall also include a clear statement of consequences should adequate progress not occur by the end of the third year. The consequences may range from suspension of pay raises to, in the most extreme cases, reduction in rank, temporary suspension of employment, or termination of employment.

H. Appeals

The Faculty Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee shall consider problems and appeals that arise from PTR.

I. 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 from employment, suspended, or demoted in rank only for reasons of incompetence, neglect of duty or misconduct of such a nature as to indicate that an individual is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty" (*Code of the University of North Carolina*, Chapter VI, Section 603). Disciplinary actions for noncompliance with the development plan are limited to those established in Chapter VI of the *Code of the University of North Carolina*. Due process and the right of appeal as specified in the *Code of the University of North Carolina* and the "Tenure Policies and Regulations of Western Carolina University" in the Faculty Handbook shall be guaranteed.

ATTACHMENT B: 2009 AA-12

WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY **AA-12**

TRANSMITTAL FORM FOR RECOMMENDATION ON (1 FORM FOR EACH ACTION TO BE TAKEN)	☐ REAPPOINTMENT (COMPLETE ITEMS 1-8, 10 & 12) (COMPLETE # 9 IF APPLICABLE)	☐ PROMOTION (COMPLETE ALL)	☐ TENURE (COMPLETE ALL)	☐ POST TENURE REVIEW (COMPLETE ITEMS 1-8 & 10)

DATE: _____ PAGE___ OF____

1	FULL NAME	LAST	FIRST	MIDDLE	DEPARTMENT

2	PROPOSED RANK	

3	PRESENT RANK		YEAR

4	PREVIOUS WCU RANK(S)		YEAR

5	ACADEMIC RECORD (INSTITUTIONS ATTENDED)			
	DEGREE	YEAR	INSTITUTION	YEARS ATTENDED

6	I have thoroughly reviewed the candidate's materials and attest that the information submitted is accurate to the best of my knowledge.
	Department Head Signature _____ date _____

7	DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE VOTES: MEETING DATE:	YES	NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN	RECOMMENDED BY DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE:	YES	NO
	LIST BELOW THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:					LIST BELOW THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHO WERE ABSENT:		

	DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW ACTION:
	DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE SECRETARY'S SIGNATURE: _____ *DATE:* _____

8	*DEPARTMENT HEAD RECOMMENDATION*	*YES* ☐		*NO* ☐

	DEPARTMENT HEAD DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW ACTION::
	SIGNATURE: _____ *DATE:* _____

9	College Committee Votes: Meeting Date:	Yes	No	Absent	Abstain	Recommended by College Committee:	Yes	No

College Committee Description of Review Action:

College Committee Secretary's Signature: _____ Date: _____

10	Recommendation of Dean:	Yes		No		

Dean's Description of Review Action:

Dean's Signature: _____ Date: _____

11	University Committee Votes: Meeting Date:	Yes	No	Absent	Abstain	Recommended by University Committee:	Yes	No

University Committee's Description of Review Action:

University Committee Secretary's Signature: _____ Date: _____

12	Recommended by Provost:	Yes	No

Provost's Description of Review Action:

Provost's Signature: _____ Date: _____