

UNC CHARLOTTE ACADEMIC PROCEDURE: POST-TENURE REVIEW

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This procedure outlines the process for reviewing tenured faculty members based on their performance and is established pursuant to [UNC System Policy 400.3.3, Performance Review of Tenured Faculty \(Post-Tenure Review\)](#) and [Regulation 400.3.3.1\[R\], Regulation on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty \(Post-Tenure Review\)](#).

II. POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURE OVERVIEW

A. Purpose of Post-Tenure Review

The Post-Tenure Review provides for the periodic and comprehensive review of all aspects of the performance of faculty members who have tenure and whose primary duties are teaching, research, and service. The purpose of such a review is to promote faculty development, productivity, and excellence by:

1. Recognizing and rewarding faculty performance that exceeds expectations;
2. Providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of faculty performance for those faculty who do not meet expectations and assisting faculty members in meeting university performance expectations; and
3. Providing the imposition of appropriate sanctions, consistent with Chapter VI of The Code of the University, for faculty who do not meet goals established in a faculty success plan.

Faculty performance is examined relative to the mission of UNC Charlotte and that of the college and department of the faculty member.

B. Applicability of Post-Tenure Review Process

The Post-Tenure Review process is applicable to all tenured members of the faculty who have been on a continuous contract for a period of five years or more since their last

cumulative review. A faculty member shall undergo a completed cumulative review no less frequently than once every five years.

If a faculty member is reassigned to other duties (e.g., Department Chair or Academic Unit Head) for .50 FTE or more, or is occupying a leave-earning position (e.g., SAAO Tier I or Tier II), that faculty member shall not be required to undergo post-tenure review until having completed a five-year cycle following the reassignment, regardless of the length of reassignment.

C. Relationship between Post-Tenure Review and Review for Promotion

Post-Tenure Review will be coordinated with the review of a faculty member for promotion in the following ways:

A departmental consideration for promotion five years after a faculty member receives tenure and/or successful promotion satisfies the requirements for the faculty member's Post-Tenure Review. One outcome of the promotion review could be a requirement that the faculty member prepare a faculty success plan as described below.

If a faculty member postpones the application for promotion five years after receiving tenure, they will undergo a Post-Tenure Review. The Post-Tenure Review, in this case, would satisfy the requirement of a promotion review five years after the award of tenure.

D. Review of Procedure

This procedure will be certified annually by the Provost to ensure all aspects of the post-tenure review process are in compliance with [System Policy 400.3.3](#) and [Regulation 400.3.3.1\[R\]](#) and shall note UNC Charlotte's compliance in an annual report on post-tenure review to the UNC System Office. In addition, the UNC System Office will conduct a review of the post-tenure review process on a five-year rotating cycle, unless irregularities are identified, in compliance with [UNC System Policy 400.3.3](#) and [Regulation 400.3.3.1\[R\]](#). If such irregularities are identified, then the UNC System Office shall conduct more frequent reviews of the institution, as deemed appropriate by the president or designee. As part of this review, the president or designee shall certify that the constituent institution is in compliance with all aspects of [UNC System Policy 400.3.3](#) and [Regulation 400.3.3.1\[R\]](#).

E. Five-Year Work Plans

At the beginning of the post-tenure review cycle, the faculty member and the Chair or Academic Unit Head shall develop a long-term work plan. At UNC Charlotte, a long-term work plan shall be for five years. The five-year work plan shall be coordinated with the annual work plans and evaluations required by [UNC Policy 400.3.4, Policy on Faculty Workload](#) and contain elements outlined in the [UNC Charlotte Academic Policy and Procedure: Faculty Workload](#), although annual evaluations are not a substitute for the comprehensive, periodic, cumulative performance (post-tenure) review required by the Board of Governors. Faculty members, may, in consultation with the Chair or Academic Unit Head, modify their five-year work plans annually, if deemed appropriate by changes in institutional, departmental, or personal circumstances. Plan modifications must be approved by the college Dean (or appropriate next-level supervisor).

III. POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES

A. Training and Support of Institutional Decision Makers

All post-tenure review evaluators, including the Review Committee, Department Chairs or Academic Unit Heads (referred to throughout this Procedure as “Chairs”), and Deans, are required to complete the UNC training module prior to review of a Post-Tenure Review file.

B. Initiating the Review Process

Whenever a Post-Tenure Review is initiated, the Chair shall first consult with the faculty member and then shall establish a schedule for the conduct of the review by the Review Committee (see definition below). Ordinarily, a faculty member should be given at least four months’ notice that one is to be reviewed.

C. Review File

To initiate the review process, the Department Chair, in cooperation with the faculty member, shall construct a Post-Tenure Review file containing only:

- a. copies of the faculty member’s last five annual evaluation letters from the Department Chair including any faculty success plans that were required during the last five years;
- b. a current curriculum vitae;
- c. the plan or plans that cover(s) the prior five years and set of goals with related milestones; and

- d. a self-evaluation statement describing their professional accomplishments in teaching, research and service covering the five-year review period. The structure of the self-evaluation statement, including specifics on length, format, and required information for the self-assessment, shall be determined at the college level.
- e. If necessary for clarification, the Chair or Review Committee may request further information from the faculty member.

D. The Review Committee

The Department Review Committee or a special Evaluation Committee elected by the tenured members of the department shall conduct the review of the faculty member's performance. The Committee shall consist of no fewer than three (3) tenured faculty members from the department and shall be elected according to the department, college and University procedures. The faculty member being reviewed will not have the option of selecting members of the Review Committee.

The Review Committee shall review the Post-Tenure Review file and may meet with the Chair and the faculty member, either together or separately. The Committee may consult other sources of information not included in the file, if deemed appropriate, with the approval of the Chair.

In accordance with the schedule for the review established by the Chair, the Review Committee shall make a written assessment of the faculty member's performance. The Review Committee Report is advisory to the Chair.

The Report shall include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's performance. The Review Committee shall provide a brief, written rationale for each assessment ("Exceeds Expectations", "Meets Expectations", "Does Not Meet Expectations") in each relevant category (teaching, research/creative activity, service), in accordance with the faculty member's five-year work plan(s) and allocation of duties. This written assessment shall conclude with one of the following overall findings:

"Exceeds Expectations:" The faculty member consistently and considerably surpasses established goals in the faculty member's annual and five-year work plans.. Any performance review that includes a recommendation for recognition of performance that exceeds expectations shall include a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of how the faculty member exceeded assigned duties and the directional goals established.

“Meets Expectations:” The faculty member consistently achieves and may occasionally surpass established goals in the faculty member’s annual and five-year work plans.

“Does Not Meet Expectations:” The faculty member does not consistently achieve established goals in the faculty member’s annual and five-year work plans. Any performance review that indicates the faculty member does not meet expectations shall state the faculty member’s primary responsibilities and describe the performance deficiencies as they relate to the faculty member’s assigned duties and the goals established.

The standards for determining “Exceeds Expectations”, “Meets Expectations” and “Does Not Meet Expectations” shall be determined by the faculty in each unit, and, when approved by the appropriate Chair and Dean, and by the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, shall become part of the unit’s Post-Tenure Review procedures.

The Chair shall provide the faculty member being reviewed a copy of both the Review Committee report and the Chair’s recommendation. The report and any response from the faculty member shall be made a part of the faculty member’s permanent personnel record.

E. Review by Chair and Dean

1. Review by the Chair

The Review Committee submits its written evaluation to the Chair, and the Chair conducts an evaluative review. The Chair shall provide a separate, written evaluation of the faculty member. That evaluation shall explicitly state points of concurrence or points of variation from the Review Committee. Any recommendation for a faculty success plan or for recognition of performance that exceeds expectations shall be accompanied by a specific rationale for that recommendation.

In the event that the Chair’s evaluation differs from that of the Review Committee, the Chair will communicate in writing to the faculty member, the Dean, and the Review Committee.

Before the Chair submits their evaluation to the Dean, they shall provide the evaluation to the faculty member under review, and the faculty member shall have no fewer than fourteen (14) calendar days from receiving these documents to provide a written response. If the faculty member under review disagrees with the evaluation, the response shall offer evidence in support of a different assessment. The response shall become part of the

permanent record of the post-tenure review moving forward. If the faculty member does not wish to provide a written response, they may notify the Chair in writing that they do not plan to respond.

2. Review by the Dean

After receipt of the faculty member's written response, if any, the Chair submits their written appraisal, including any response from the faculty member under review to the Dean, along with the Review Committee report and the faculty member's materials. The Dean conducts an evaluative review in addition to the review conducted by the committee and the Chair. The Dean shall provide a written evaluative review based on the faculty member's materials and the reports of the Review Committee, the Chair, and any written response from the faculty member. Other than relief available through an institutional grievance process, the dean's rating is the final rating (and one reported to the UNC System Office). The Dean's response and written evaluation shall be provided to the faculty member, the Chair, and the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and shall include the faculty success plan or sanction imposed, if applicable.

3. Faculty Grievance or Hearing

Following the final review and determination of the Dean, a faculty member dissatisfied with the results of the Post-Tenure Review may pursue any option otherwise available to faculty members relating to matters that affect their employment status. If disciplinary discharge, suspension, or demotion s are imposed as a result of a seriously deficient post-tenure performance review, University regulations for hearing procedures outlined in **[Section 8 of the Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of The University of North Carolina at Charlotte](#)** will apply. For lesser actions, a faculty member may pursue a grievance through the UNC Charlotte "**[Procedures for Resolving Faculty Grievances Arising from Section 607\(3\) of The Code of The University of North Carolina.](#)**"

F. Post-Tenure Review Completion

1. Exceeds Expectations

A faculty member whose review results in an overall rating of "Exceeds Expectations" shall be considered to have completed the post-tenure review process. Faculty members whose review results in a rating of exceeding expectations may be considered by the Office of Academic Affairs for nomination of future local, state, and/or national awards.

2. Meets Expectations

A faculty member whose review results in an overall rating of “meets expectations” shall be considered to have completed the post-tenure review process.

G. Faculty Success Plan

When the Dean determines that the faculty member’s performance does not meet expectations, the Chair will require that the faculty member have a written success plan that includes specific steps designed to lead to the faculty member’s improved performance in achieving established goals in their annual and five-year work plans. The success plan will be prepared jointly by the Chair and faculty member. The faculty member and Chair are required to engage in good faith discussions to prepare the faculty success plan, but if the faculty member and Chair are unable to agree on a plan after good faith discussions, the Chair and the Dean, in consultation with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, have the authority to develop the success plan independently. The faculty success plan will include at a minimum:

- a. the expectations of the Chair as to how the faculty member can remedy the deficiency or deficiencies in performance or enhance the faculty member’s professional accomplishments and contributions to the unit;
- b. specific performance goals and objectives, timetables for achieving such goals over a two-to-three year period, and the criteria to be used in measuring progress toward the performance goals;
- c. the resources or developmental support, if any, the Chair is willing and able to provide the faculty member to assist in implementing the plan;
- d. any adjustment in workload, assignments or responsibilities of the faculty member in order to enhance their performance and contribution to the mission of the unit; and
- e. clear statement of consequences should deficiencies not be corrected within the designated timeline. Progress meetings with the department chair must occur on at least a semi-annual basis during the specified timeframe.

The Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean, may redefine faculty workloads and distribution of teaching, research/creative activity, and service in cases where a faculty member receives a “does not meet expectations” post-tenure review assessment. The Chair and Dean shall ensure any changes to these duties are not punitive responses to the faculty member and instead address ways to support the department, school/college, and institution to better leverage the faculty member’s expertise and abilities and improve their performance.

The faculty success plan shall detail the changes in duties and responsibilities. The faculty member's annual work plan shall also change accordingly to ensure the faculty member is evaluated appropriately, based on the relevant allocation of workload.

The success plan will be reviewed by the Dean, who may make suggestions for improving the plan. Once the faculty success plan has been approved by the Dean, the faculty member is required to proceed with implementation.

H. Monitoring and Re-evaluation of Performance

Progress towards achieving the goals and timetables set out in the development plan will be reviewed in subsequent annual reviews by the Chair, who will provide detailed feedback to the faculty member and a copy to the Dean. At the end of the time period specified in the development plan, the Chair, in consultation with the Review Committee, will review the faculty member's performance and make one of the following recommendations:

The faculty member has improved their performance, and no further action is necessary pending the next regularly scheduled Post-Tenure Review;

The faculty member's performance has improved but not at the expected level. The Chair may require an adjustment in the faculty success plan or in the faculty member's workload in order to improve further the faculty member's performance; or

The faculty member's performance continues to not meet expectations. The Chairperson may recommend the imposition of appropriate sanctions. Any decision to recommend imposition of serious sanctions should occur only after the widest consultation with the tenured faculty in the department; whether this involves a poll or other mechanism is left up to the department. However, the department is expected to transmit the outcome of such consultation with the tenured faculty to the Dean. The Chair's recommendation is forwarded to the faculty member and the Dean.

I. Dean's Review and the Possible Imposition of Sanctions

The Dean reviews the recommended action:

- If the Dean agrees with a departmental recommendation that no further action is necessary, the review process stops pending the next regularly scheduled Post-Tenure Review.
- If the Dean agrees with a recommendation for a workload adjustment, the adjustment is implemented and the review stops pending the next regularly scheduled Post-

Tenure Review.

- If the Dean agrees with a departmental recommendation for the imposition of serious sanctions, the Dean forwards this recommendation to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. Serious sanctions may be imposed only in accord with [Section VI, of the Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of The University of North Carolina at Charlotte](#) and [Chapter VI of The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina](#). Serious sanctions that may be imposed include demotion, salary reduction and, in the most serious cases, may include a recommendation for discharge. A faculty member retains full rights to seek a hearing if the decision is made to impose serious sanctions. Neither a negative review nor an insufficient improvement from a development plan will necessarily result in the imposition of sanctions; such sanctions may be imposed only upon grounds specified in [Section VI of the Tenure Policies](#) and [Chapter VI of The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina](#). In the imposition of serious sanctions, the burden of proof is on the University to prove that the serious deficiencies on the development plan constitute incompetence or neglect of duty.
- If the Dean disagrees with the departmental decision, the departmental and Dean's recommendation are forwarded to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs for review.

III. DEFINITIONS

There are no Definitions for this procedure.

IV. PROCEDURE CONTACT(S)

- **Authority:** [Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs](#)
- **Responsible Office:** [Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs](#)
- **Additional Contact(s):** n/a

V. HISTORY

- **Revised:** March 26, 2015
- **Revised:** March 23, 2016 [minor clarifying edits in the Faculty Grievance or Hearing (formerly Faculty Appeals) section]
- **Revised:** April 13, 2020 [[faculty given automatic one year extension to complete dossier due to COVID-19 pandemic](#)]
- **Revised:** May 23, 2024 [updated in accordance with UNC System Policy 400.3.3, Performance Review of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review) and UNC System Regulation 400.3.3.1[R], Regulation on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review) and endorsed by Faculty Council]

VI. PRIOR VERSIONS

- [April 13, 2020 – May 22, 2024](#)

VII. RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND RESOURCES

- [UNC System Policy 400.3.3, Performance Review of Tenured Faculty \(Post-Tenure Review\)](#)
- [UNC System Regulation 400.3.3.1\[R\], Regulation on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty \(Post-Tenure Review\)](#)
- [Chapter VI of The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina](#)
- [Training: Conducting Post-Tenure Review at UNC Institutions](#)

VIII. FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

- **Where is this procedure referenced?**
The procedure is published on the Academic Policies & Procedures webpage of the [Provost website](#).
- **Who is responsible for the written five-year plan and the associated set of goals and milestones?**
The faculty member under review is responsible for their five-year plan. The plan can be modified annually by the faculty member in consultation with the department chair.
- **Once a faculty member on a development plan reaches “acceptable” level, when is their next review?**
The faculty member continues to be reviewed on their original review schedule.
- **Questions about RPT Extension for Spring 2020 due to COVID-19 Pandemic?**
See the [separate FAQs page](#).

CAMPUS LINKS

Alerts
Jobs
Make a Gift

RESOURCES

Alumni & Friends
Faculty & Staff
Prospective Students