**Post Tenure Review Policy and Procedure Update**

**for Joint Department Head Council and Collegial Review Council Meeting**

**Monday, January 12, 2015**

**Summary**: At their June 20, 2014 meeting, the Board of Governors approved changes to UNC Policy 400.3.3 – *Performance Review of Tenured Faculty* that had been suggested by a BOG working group. These changes are essentially:

1. Changing from the current (2) review conclusions (satisfactory, unsatisfactory) to three review conclusions (exceeds, meets, and doesn’t meet);
2. The dean is now required to participate in the evaluative review with a decision at their level, rather than our current process in which the dean acknowledging the decision at the department level;
3. At the beginning of the post-tenure review (5 year) cycle, each faculty member is to propose a set of “directional goals” (which should include milestones) on which the post-tenure review will be based. These directional goals must meet their department head’s approval, though directional goals can be modified annual by the faculty member, in consultation with the department chair, as deemed appropriate;
4. The provost must annually certify that all aspects of the post-tenure review process at an institution are in compliance with this UNC Policy and its associated guidelines (400.3.3.1[G]);
5. Each institution must have ongoing training and support for all post-tenure review evaluators; and
6. UNC General Administration will conduct process audits (and initial training) to ensure compliance (starting in the 2015-2016 fiscal year and revisited on a three-year rotating cycle);

**Purpose of Joint Meeting between Collegial Review Council and Department Heads Council:**

To brain-storm solutions for bringing WCU’s Post Tenure Review (PTR) process in compliance with the recent BOG changes in a way that empowers faculty and is in keeping with WCU’s stated purpose for PTR (excerpt from Section 4.08 A. ):

“*The purpose of this review is to support continuing faculty development, to promote faculty vitality, and to encourage excellence among tenured faculty*.”

**Some Issues for Consideration**

ISSUE: All faculty are to have developed directional goals, in consultation with their department heads, upon which their post-tenure review will be based (along with a current curriculum vitae and annual faculty evaluation summaries). If compliance by 2015-2016 means that all tenured faculty are to have directional goals established by August 2015, this would not be feasible.

POSSIBLE MANAGEMENT: Individuals will propose directional goals by the start of their next post-tenure review cycle, rather than immediately. Thus, all tenured faculty will have directional goals established by the start of the 2020-2021 academic year.

ISSUE: All faculty are to have their directional goals approved by their department heads. What if they cannot come to an agreement? It seems this would also have to be spelled-out in the Post Tenure Review policies and procedures.

POSSIBLE MANAGEMENT: Perhaps these issues could go to the Faculty Grievance Committee, as part of the Post Tenure Review Appeals?

ISSUE: As post-tenure review criteria should be established in the DCRD, and now PTR must also include expectations regarding a faculty member’s achievements in terms of their directional goals as well.

POSSIBLE MANAGEMENT: Revise DCRD’s to include expectations regarding fulfillment of directional goals, this way expectations are determined at the department level rather than the university level.

ISSUE: The new PTR Policy (400.3.3 1(e)) states that “both the department chair/unit head and the dean must conduct an evaluative review in the cumulative review process”. Right now, our dean only receives the evaluations from the departmental PTR committee and the department head. The candidate does not see the evaluation from the department head.

POSSIBLE MANAGEMENT: ??? Give the committee, DH, and Dean the same charge, to evaluate the faculty member based upon departmental PTR criteria and their directional goals???

ISSUE: How can we assure that directional goals are consistent in expectations across the university (as CRD’s criteria for tenure and promotion are to be consistent in expectations across the university) if directional goals are now used in the evaluation?

POSSIBLE MANAGEMENT:??? A college level review that tries to maintain consistency across the directional goals developed in each college?

ISSUE: One of the purposes of PTR is to reward faculty for exemplary performance (i.e. rated as exceeds expectations), but typically no reward is given.

POSSIBLE MANAGEMENT: Guarantee a fixed salary bump for those who exceed in PTR evaluations? This does not appear to be used at other UNC institution. One does have a committee that looks at PTR cases that were rated as “exceeds expectations” and the committee determines merit pay increases. Others provide some sort of non-monetary recognition (awards, course release).

ISSUE: It seems as if we’ll need to adjust our Annual Faculty Evaluation policy and procedures to include aspects of directional goals for tenured faculty, according to 400.3.3.1[G] 6 which ends with “Directional goals should include milestones that will be incorporated into annual performance evaluations.”

POSSIBLE MANAGEMENT: Just update DCRDs rather than University Policy?