

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY MANUAL

PART IX

Appointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Advancement  
Policies and Procedures  
and  
Performance Review of Tenured Faculty

PART IX – APPOINTMENT, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND ADVANCEMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

SECTION II

Performance Review of Tenured Faculty of East Carolina University  
(Revised 10-15)

- I. Preamble
  - II. Description of Policy
    - A. Timing
    - B. Performance Standards for the Review
    - C. Performance Review Committee (PRC)
    - D. Review Process
    - E. Rewards
    - F. Reconsideration
    - G. Faculty Development Plan
    - H. Subsequent Evaluation
  - III. Form: Faculty 5-Year Plan [Guidelines for Faculty 5-Year Plan](#) (link provides both forms)  
Form: Report on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty
- 

I. Preamble

On May 16, 1997, the Board of Governors mandated the review of performance of tenured faculty in the University of North Carolina system. This review, defined as the comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, has the purposes of ensuring faculty development and promoting faculty vitality. The June 24, 1997, Administrative Memorandum #371 from the General Administration of the UNC System required each constituent institution to create a policy that examines individual faculty contributions to departmental, school/college, and university goals as well as to the academic programs in which faculty teach. Guidelines mandate that the process shall recognize and reward exemplary faculty performance; provide for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found deficient; and, for those whose performance remains deficient, provide for the possible imposition of appropriate sanctions or further action, including discharge. Further guidelines direct individual institutions to show the relationship between annual review and performance review, examine faculty performance relative to the mission of the unit and the university, include a review no less frequently than every five years, explicitly involve peers in the review process, assure written feedback as well as a mechanism for faculty response to the evaluation, and require individual development plans for all faculty receiving less than satisfactory ratings in the performance review.

On June 20, 2014, the UNC Board of Governors revised its *Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty* (The UNC Policy Manual: 400.3.3.1(G)).

East Carolina University's Policy for the Performance Review of Tenured Faculty meets the revised guidelines of the University of North Carolina General Administration and is consistent with East Carolina University's Faculty Manual and The Code of the University. This policy does not create a process for the reevaluation or revalidation of tenured status. The basic standard for appraisal and

evaluation is whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties associated with his or her position. Furthermore, the policy is created with the widespread presumption of competence on the part of each tenured faculty member. The performance review for a faculty member must reflect the nature of the individual's field or work and must conform to fair and reasonable expectations as recognized by faculty peers in each department and discipline. The review must be conducted in a manner free of arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory elements and must follow these agreed-upon procedures.

## II. Description of Policy

### A. Timing

At five-year intervals, each academic unit shall review all aspects of each permanently tenured faculty member's professional performance during the preceding five years. A review leading to promotion in rank qualifies as a performance review. A faculty member granted promotion and/or permanent tenure shall be reviewed within five years of that decision. Probationary-term faculty members are excluded because other review mechanisms exist to evaluate their performance. Unit\* administrators, deans, and administrators at the division or university level shall be excluded from this policy. After returning to full-time teaching/research responsibilities, administrators shall be evaluated in the first review period following the return and at all following five-year intervals. In any case where the review period is shorter than five, the expectations shall be adjusted accordingly.

Each academic unit's Tenure Committee shall decide whether all of its tenured faculty will be reviewed in the same year (block plan) or whether its tenured faculty will be reviewed according to a serial plan. Those units choosing a serial plan shall also determine the method of serialization.

### B. Performance Standards for the Review

For the cumulative review of performance for the review period, the unit's Tenure Committee shall follow its standards of "meets," "exceeds," or "does not meet" expectations as described in the unit code. Immediately after each review period, the Tenure Committee shall review and revise the performance standards as necessary. These standards will comply with the provisions of Part VIII, Section I (subsections C and D) of the *ECU Faculty Manual*, the unit's code provisions, and the primacy of instruction within the UNC system institutions. These standards should be consistent with the mission of the institution, college, and program and with the changing goals of both the unit and the university. While also considering varying expectations at the time of the granting of permanent tenure for individual faculty members, these standards should address the faculty member's teaching, research, service, and other duties, including contributions to the departmental, college/school, and university goals, contributions to the academic programs in which the faculty member teaches, and any other professional activities bearing on the faculty member's performance of his or her duties during the period under review.

### C. Performance Review Committee (PRC)

The Tenure Committee will elect a minimum of three faculty members and one alternate from the permanently tenured voting faculty (*ECU Faculty Manual*, Part IX, Section I (IV.)). Voting Faculty Member) not holding administrative status to serve on the Performance Review Committee. The alternate shall serve when a member is unable to serve. Members on the Performance Review Committee shall serve for one academic year.

When a unit is unable to elect three permanently tenured voting faculty members not holding administrative status, the next higher administrator above the unit level shall appoint permanently tenured voting faculty members not holding administrative status from other units to increase the

committee's membership to three members and one alternate. These appointments to the committee must be from one list of candidates selected by a vote of the permanently tenured and probationary-term voting faculty of the unit. The list forwarded to the next higher administrator by the appropriate faculty will contain at least twice the number of faculty members required to complete the membership of the committee. Before voting on the list to be forwarded to the next higher administrator, the voting faculty will ascertain that faculty members nominated to have their names placed on the list are willing and able to serve in this important capacity. The list of faculty names recommended to the next higher administrator may not be returned for revision.

#### D. Review Process

Performance Review of Tenured Faculty shall cover all aspects of the faculty member's professional performance. The review will be informed by the faculty member's annual reports and annual evaluations (*ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VIII, Section I (III.). Evaluations) and consistent with the faculty member's 5-year plan (utilizing the form in Section III or an alternate five-year plan approved in the unit code), but primarily shall be based on a comprehensive assessment of the faculty member's teaching, research, service, and other duties, including contributions to the departmental college/school and university goals, contributions to the academic programs in which the faculty member teaches, and any other professional activities bearing on the faculty member's performance of his or her duties during the period under review. For permanently tenured full-time faculty members who have received University approved leaves of absence, the expectations for the review period will be adjusted accordingly. A permanently tenured faculty member who is on leave during a block plan will be reviewed at time of their return to full-time service.

Should a subsequent academic unit administrator disagree with the annual reviews and annual reports of an individual faculty member composed before the term of office of the incumbent administrator, the administrator shall not dismiss, alter, or argue against the body and conclusions of the earlier annual reviews and reports.

The initial review shall be conducted by the unit administrator who, using the attached Form, shall prepare a performance review report which shall consist of a narrative evaluation of the overall performance of the candidate that takes into account the relative weights assigned to each duty during each of the years being reviewed and the amount of reassigned time from teaching to the performance of other duties for each year under review. This evaluation shall conclude with an overall ranking that categorizes each faculty member's performance as "meets," "exceeds," or "does not meet" expectations.. A negative review must include a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member's assigned duties.

The evaluative report, together with the faculty member's annual reports and annual performance evaluations for the period under review, a copy of the faculty member's 5-year plan, a copy of the faculty member's current curriculum vita, and any other material the faculty member provided to the review committee in support of his/her professional performance over the review period, shall be forwarded to the Performance Review Committee and shall become part of the permanent personnel file. For each faculty member, the Performance Review Committee shall either agree or disagree with the evaluation of the unit administrator.

When the unit administrator and the Performance Review Committee agree, the Performance Review Committee shall report this agreement on the Form. The unit administrator shall provide a copy of the report to the faculty member and place a copy of the report in the faculty member's personnel file.

When the unit administrator and Performance Review Committee disagree, every effort (including discussion and negotiation) shall be made to resolve the disagreement within the unit. If the effort to resolve the disagreement fails, the Performance Review Committee shall prepare its own report. The unit administrator shall provide copies of both reports to the faculty member and the matter will be referred to the next higher administrator, who after reviewing both reports and the faculty member's supporting materials, shall make an independent decision, which shall be reported in writing to the faculty member and forwarded, together with Committee and unit administrator reports, to the Provost (or Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences).

The faculty member may provide the unit administrator with a written response within 10 calendar days of receiving his or her unit-level performance review (see Section II F). A copy of the faculty member's response will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file and provided to the Performance Review Committee. The response will also be shared at the next highest administrative level.

The next higher administrator shall review all Performance Review reports, including any faculty member's response to those reports, and either concur or not concur, then notify the unit administrator and the chair of the unit Performance Review Committee, and forward her/his review to the Provost or the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences who is responsible for ensuring the integrity of the review process. The Provost will annually certify to the UNC President or his/her designee that all aspects of the review process are in compliance with UNC Policy 400.3.3.

Immediately after the completion of each level of administrative review, the administrator's report shall be communicated to all appropriate lower-level administrators, the tenured faculty member, and the Unit Performance Review Committee.

A copy of the report shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

A faculty member may provide the unit administrator with a written response within 10 calendar days of receiving his or her unit-level performance review. A copy of the faculty member's response will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file and provided to the Performance Review Committee. A faculty member's response will be forwarded to the next higher administrator.

At the discretion of the faculty member, the final review may be appealed in accordance with the provisions of the grievance procedure of Part XII, Section I, as appropriate.

#### E. Rewards

The revised UNC Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty require that faculty whose post-tenure performance exceeds expectations shall be recognized and rewarded. A faculty member whose performance is deemed to have exceeded expectation may be recognized in ways including, but not limited to, nomination for awards, merit salary increases, research leaves, and/or revisions of work load.

#### F. Reconsideration

A faculty member whose unit-level review process determines a performance level that does not meet expectations shall have the opportunity to respond within 10 calendar days. The faculty member may request that the unit administrator and Performance Review Committee reconsider the evaluation based on additional substantive information provided by the faculty member. In

reconsidering the evaluation, the unit administrator and Performance Review Committee shall have the opportunity to nullify, modify, or reconfirm the original evaluation (or evaluations, in the case of disagreement between the committee and the unit administrator). The response of the faculty member to the report of deficient performance and the decision of the committee and the unit administrator shall be reported to the next higher administrator (as outlined in Section II, D).

When the committee and the unit administrator disagree on the appropriate action after a reconsideration initiated by the faculty member under review, every effort (including discussion and negotiation) shall be made to resolve the disagreement within the unit. If the effort fails, the conflicting responses to the reconsideration appeal by the faculty member under review shall be referred to the next higher administrator for final decision.

The decision of each administrator shall be reported in writing to the faculty member and a copy of each decision shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file and provided to both the Performance Review Committee and the unit administrator.

At the discretion of the faculty member, the final review may be appealed in accordance with the provisions of the grievance procedure of Part XII, Section I, as appropriate.

#### G. Faculty Development Plan

A faculty member whose performance does not meet expectations shall negotiate a formal development plan with the Performance Review Committee and the unit administrator. The development plan must: (a) identify specific shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member's performance of his or her assigned duties; (b) state any modification of duties due to a less than satisfactory rating and take into account the new allocation of responsibilities; (c) include specific steps designed to lead to the required degree of improvement; (d) specify resources necessary to support the development plan, (e) specify a reasonable timeline of no more than three academic years, in which improvement is expected to occur; (f) schedule and require written records of progress meetings between the faculty member, the unit administrator and the chair of the Performance Review Committee at regular intervals no less frequently than twice each academic year; (g) state the consequences for the faculty member should improvement not occur within the designated timeline. The use of mentoring peers is encouraged.

The description of specific steps designed to lead to improvement shall state guidelines, present criteria by which the faculty member could monitor his or her progress, and identify the source of any institutional commitments, if required. The plan is a commitment by the faculty member, with support provided by the Performance Review Committee, and the unit administrator to improve the faculty member's performance. Adequate resources shall be provided to support the plan. The plan shall be consistent with the faculty member's academic freedom (as defined by the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part V), shall be self-directed by the faculty member, and shall be sufficiently flexible to allow for subsequent amendment, if necessary. Such amendment will follow the same process as the development of the original plan. If the unit administrator, Performance Review Committee, and faculty member cannot agree on a formal development plan, each party's draft of a plan will be forwarded to the next higher administrator, who will make the final decision.

The faculty member's development progress shall be reviewed in a meeting that occurs at least twice each academic year with the Performance Review Committee and the unit administrator. The unit administrator shall provide a written evaluation of progress to the faculty member. If the unit administrator, the Performance Review Committee, and the faculty member cannot agree on the

faculty member's progress, the next higher administration will meet with the relevant parties and make a final determination. A copy of this evaluation will be provided to the faculty member and placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

#### H. Subsequent Evaluation

If the unit administrator and the Performance Review Committee finds that the faculty member's cumulative performance exceeds or meets expectations within the specified timeline, the unit administrator shall report the results of the performance review in writing to the faculty member and place a copy of the written evaluation in the faculty member's personnel file. In this case, the faculty member will return to the regular schedule of post-tenure review.

If the faculty member's cumulative performance level remains below expectations after the specified timelines, the unit administrator may recommend that serious sanctions be imposed as governed by Part IX, Section I (VI), "Due Process Before Discharge or Imposition of Serious Sanction," of the *ECU Faculty Manual* and Chapter VI of *The Code* of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina.

\*With respect to personnel matters relating to Performance Review, academic units are defined as departments described in the codes of operation of professional schools, the departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, professional schools without departments, Academic Library Services, Health Sciences Library, and any other units in which faculty appointments are made. In the College of Arts and Sciences and in professional schools whose unit codes describe departmental structures, departmental chairs are the unit administrators. In schools that do not have departments described in their unit codes, the dean of the school is the unit administrator.

#### I. Training

All parties involved in the Performance Review of Tenured Faculty evaluations, including peer evaluators of the Performance Review Committee, department chairs, unit administrators, and deans, shall complete performance review training. Training will be provided (1) as digital training modules provided by UNC General Administration and (2) as face-to-face campus-specific policy and personnel training provided by the Faculty Senate office in cooperation with the office of the Provost.

### III. Form: Faculty 5-Year Plan [Guidelines for Faculty 5-Year Plan](#) (link provides both forms)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

College: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Responsibilities and Mutual Expectations

*(Most faculty members will have responsibilities in three or more of these, but in all cases the anticipated weights in the areas of responsibility must be consistent with those outlined in the department's unit code)*

     % Teaching.





**Form: Report on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty**

Performance Review of Tenured Faculty  
East Carolina University

Faculty member: \_\_\_\_\_

School/department: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

I. Narrative Evaluation of most recent 5 years of faculty performance:

II. Summary Performance Review Evaluation indicate meets, does not meet, or exceeds expectations in each category (other categories may be added as documented on the unit code):

\_\_\_\_\_ Teaching

\_\_\_\_\_ Research/Creative Activity

\_\_\_\_\_ Service

\_\_\_\_\_ Overall

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_

Unit Administrator

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

Performance Review Committee Response:

\_\_\_\_\_ Agree

\_\_\_\_\_ Disagree

\_\_\_\_\_ Committee Chair

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

\_\_\_\_\_ Faculty Member

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

(Note: faculty member signature acknowledges neither agreement nor disagreement with the report.)

- 
- Faculty Senate Resolution #98-13, April 1998
  - Faculty Senate Resolution #98-29, November 1998
  - Interpretation I98-10 made to Section II., October 1998
  - Faculty Senate Resolution #08-42, August 2010 (UNC General Administration)
  - Faculty Senate Resolution #09-33, August 2010 (UNC General Administration)
  - Faculty Senate Resolution #15-28, October 2015 (UNC General Administration)