

2014-02

## **Resolution on the Proposed Revisions to the Post Tenure Review Policy**

Approved by the UNC Faculty Assembly

April 04, 2014

---

**Whereas**, The UNC General Administration has requested feedback on the proposed changes to Post-Tenure Review generated by the Board of Governors' Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Working Group, and

**Whereas**, The Faculty Assembly has consulted with representative faculty across the system and gathered feedback on the proposed revisions; and

**Whereas**, several of the recommended changes have been widely cited as redundant or unlikely to add value to the evaluative process:

1. Evaluative review by Deans is unlikely to add substantive feedback to the PTR process, as a Dean will typically not be credentialed in all of the disciplines contained within their college. Peer review is used in academe in recognition of the substantial specialized training that is required for evaluation of the state-of-the-art pedagogy and scholarship needed to meet the rigorous expectations for faculty that have obtained tenure and/or promotion in rank.
2. The utilization of three categories of evaluation suggests that tenured faculty, who have been selected from a large pool of highly motivated and successful candidates and rigorously evaluated during an extended probationary period before obtaining tenure, are not expected to meet high standards as a routine matter. In addition, having a category of exemplary (or exceeds expectations) is redundant with annual evaluations and with merit increases associated with annual evaluations and/or promotion.
3. The imposition of five-year scholarship plans will likely lead to one of two potential outcomes. The first outcome may be plans that largely overlap with the annual goal setting and evaluation cycle, providing little value and added time burden. Long term success as a faculty member already requires substantial strategic planning and a coherent research agenda; a faculty member that has been successful over the previous five year cycle has demonstrated such skills. The second outcome may be plans that do not recognize the pace of change in the scholarship required for faculty success in a rapidly changing world. Such a plan would inhibit flexibility and innovation in research, teaching and community service; particularly, in the interdisciplinary context.
4. The policy may – and likely will – have the unintended consequence of undermining the faculty confidence that the University administration and governing bodies support and respect faculty contributions to the goals of public higher education. The consequence of this may have very serious implications for our students' educational experience, the reputation of our University system, and our ability to retain and recruit excellent faculty.

**Therefore, Be It Resolved That** the Board of Governors adopt a PTR plan that recognizes the rigor of the existing annual evaluation and promotion and tenure processes, that utilizes a two-category evaluation scale, and that avoids the redundancy of Dean-level reviews and five-year plans.