

Conducting Post-Tenure Review at UNC Institutions

(A System-wide Training Provided by General Administration
at the University of North Carolina)

About the Training

Slide 1. Why This Training?

- Recent review of UNC's Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Policy and Guidelines.
- Resulting enhancements to strengthen the PTR process.
- Mandatory training for all PTR participants.

For the final recommendations of the Post-Tenure Review Working Group, visit the Resources page associated with this training.

The Five Modules in This Training

Module 1. Introduction: PTR Scope, Purpose, and Process

Module 2. PTR Procedural Principles

Module 3. PTR Standards

Module 4. PTR Outcomes

Module 5. PTR Oversight and Maintenance

Narrator:

Before you get started with the five modules of the post-tenure review training, here's just a bit of background and orientation information.

In 2014, the UNC Board of Governors established a Post-Tenure Review Working Group to examine the existing University Policy and Guidelines on PTR along with institution-specific policies and practices. The working group's objective was to identify ways in which PTR approaches to conducting performance reviews could be strengthened, with an emphasis on consistency, rigor, and accountability. The group was made up of: Members of the BOG, chancellors, one provost, one dean, and the chair of the Faculty Assembly; and the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs acted as staff to the group. Note the reference to their final recommendations on this slide.

Several significant changes to the guidelines for UNC Policy 400.3.3.1 resulted from the working group's review. The specific changes are highlighted in the first module of this training, and then details about their implementation are addressed across the modules that follow. Specifically, the changes will help ensure that the essential and valued role of faculty across the University is appropriately assessed in a systematic and consistent fashion. And this intent can only be realized if all participants in the PTR process are well versed in how individual roles contribute to the overall process.

For this reason, this PTR training is required to be completed by every person involved in the PTR process. And, on the last page of the training, you are asked to sign an Attestation of Completion document, which you will submit to your Department Chair. You may also want to keep a copy on file for your records. Estimated time to complete the five-module training is about an hour.

Module 1. Introduction: PTR Scope, Purpose, and Process

Slide 1. Module Overview

- What is PTR?
- What are the policy considerations?
- What does the PTR process involve?

Narrator:

Welcome. And let's get started with the first module of the training, where we introduce general aspects of post-tenure review at UNC institutions. Note that throughout we'll refer to it simply as "PTR."

In this brief module, we'll touch on:

- What is PTR?
- What are the policy considerations?
- What does the PTR process involve?

Slide 2. PTR Definition & Policy

- A systematic process for conducting periodic performance reviews of tenured faculty.
- Institutions must implement a meaningful process.
- Institution policies must comply with University policies and guidelines:
 - *Policy 400.3.3 Performance Review of Tenured Faculty* (last amended 06/20/14)
 - *Guideline 400.3.3.1[G] Guidelines for Performance Review of Tenured Faculty* (06/20/14)

Narrator:

So, what is PTR? It's a systematic process for the periodic, comprehensive review of the performance of all faculty members having permanent tenure and whose primary duties are teaching, research, and/or service. And the purpose? It's to promote professional excellence and accountability.

Importantly, each UNC institution that awards tenure has recently updated its policies for implementing a meaningful process for PTR that's consistent with University policy and guidelines. In addition to following these guidelines, all individuals participating in the PTR process are encouraged to stay current on best practices for their roles—including but not limited to those addressed in these training modules.

UNC policy on PTR was first implemented back in 1998. But in 2014, the Board of Governors made significant revisions affecting institutions' policies and processes, most notably:

- Enhancing the alignment between annual performance reviews and PTR,
- Clarifying the process of a second level of review beyond the department chair or unit head,
- Providing training opportunities for those involved in the PTR evaluation process,
- Creating three assessment categories, and
- Adding the need for periodic audits on compliance with training and process requirements.

As a result, this training was developed to ensure that institutions' policies comply with UNC policies and guidelines:

- Policy 400.3.3 details the intentions and features of the process, and
- Guideline 400.3.3.1[G] addresses practices and procedures for meeting policy expectations.

Both of these are available on the Resources page associated with this training.

Slide 3. Important PTR Considerations

- Ensuring that the PTR policies reflect the mission of the institution.
- Anticipating the resources needed for implementing a meaningful review process.
- Establishing the expectation that the institution will regularly review its PTR policies.

Narrator:

The intention of the Board of Governors in requiring each constituent institution to update its own PTR policies is that each approach should reflect the specifics of the particular institutional mission. At the same time, of course, the approach must be consistent with the University's PTR policy objectives and with other University employment standards. In this regard, keep in mind that any PTR finding must also be consistent and harmonize with the University's criteria and procedures for due process, disciplinary action, or discharge and that no PTR finding can supersede those requirements.

Another important consideration is to fully assess both the financial and human resources needed to implement a meaningful review process, which might include addressing such issues as:

- Resources to recognize and reward tenured faculty who are judged to exceed expectations through this and other review processes, as well as
- Funds to support the development of faculty members who are found not to meet expectations.

In addition, PTR policies should anticipate the need to regularly re-examine the institution's approach to evaluation, planning, and program review.

Slide 4. PTR Process Overview: How frequently should reviews be conducted?

- Annual Performance Reviews.
- PTR at least every 5 years.

Narrator:

Now let's look at the PTR process at a high level. We'll get into details in other modules.

A reasonable first question is: How frequently should reviews be conducted? ...The general policy requirement is that PTRs should be conducted at intervals of no more than 5 years.

In contrast to an annual performance review, a PTR involves a more comprehensive, cumulative assessment of a tenured faculty member. But there is a presumed connection between the two. Nonetheless, while the PTR process can pull from annual reviews, a PTR must involve additional assessment as well.

Slide 5. PTR Process Overview: Who participates?

Narrator:

Another key question is: Who should be involved in the review?

Importantly, PTR is—in the first instance—a process of peer review conducted by a department committee established by a department's tenured faculty. That's if the particular institution is organized by departmental units. Note that faculty under review have no prerogatives in regard to the selection of the peer evaluation committee.

Who else is involved in the PTR?

- Along with the peer evaluation committee's assessment, the department chair (or unit head) must provide an evaluation. And in doing so, the chair is expected to consult with the peer evaluation committee.
- Next, the college or school's dean must provide an evaluation (or other appropriate academic-unit head, if the institution does not have college or school deans).
- In addition, on an annual basis, the provost of the constituent institution must certify that institutional processes are in compliance with UNC policy and guidelines, including required training for peer committee members, department chairs, and college deans.
- Finally (and importantly), the faculty member being evaluated is involved by compiling information on his or her accomplishments and providing this to other participants in the evaluation process. Then, at the end of the process, the faculty member is given an opportunity to respond to evaluation findings.

Slide 6. PTR Process Overview: What are the essential steps?

- Early on, the faculty member prepares proposed directional goals.
- Department chair reviews and approves directional goals with/without modifications.
- During the PTR, the faculty member's performance of responsibilities and achievement of directional goals are reviewed.
- Then, an assessment category will be assigned based on the faculty member's overall achievement.
- The provost certifies all aspects of the PTR process.

Narrator:

Procedurally, there are five main aspects of the PTR process.

To start the process, the faculty member prepares a set of proposed directional goals to work toward over the specified PTR time frame. Milestones must also be included for annual performance reviews.

The directional goals plan is then submitted to the department chair for review and approval. Note that the time frame for the goals can be modified annually in light of changing institutional, departmental, or personal circumstances.

Then, at the time of the PTR, reviewers should evaluate all aspects of the faculty member's performance in teaching, research, and/or service. PTR evaluators include: The peer evaluation committee; the department chair; and the dean of the college or school. And the standards used for evaluating performance need to have been clearly specified in the institution's policies.

Ultimately, reviews must specify that the faculty member's overall achievement most appropriately belongs in one of three assessment categories: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, or Does Not Meet Expectations.

Lastly, the provost of the constituent institution certifies that all aspects of the PTR process are in compliance with policy and guidelines.

Note that this training goes into greater detail on the roles of each PTR evaluator in Module 2. Information about establishing standards used for evaluating performance is presented in Module 3.

Slide 7. PTR Process Overview: What outcomes result from the review?

Review of a tenured faculty member's accomplishments at each UNC institution has both summative and formative purposes.

Narrator:

In keeping with the overarching purpose of the UNC PTR policy "to support and encourage excellence," by being both summative and formative, the review typically provides recognition for a faculty member meeting or exceeding performance standards. Faculty members found to have exceeded expectations should be recognized for their performance. And this recognition should be reinforced by what's documented in the annual performance reviews. When funding is not available for this purpose within a college or unit, how best to recognize exemplary performance can present a challenge. Other avenues of recognition that might be explored include course-release time, professional development funding, and public recognition.

In other cases, the PTR provides improvement opportunities for a tenured faculty member whose performance does not meet expectations.

In such situations, an individual development or career plan must be established that includes:

- Specific steps for achieving improved performance,
- A specified timeline for demonstrating improved performance, and
- A clear statement of the consequences of not meeting the requirements of the development plan (as defined by the department chair or college dean).

Also, progress meetings must occur on at least a semi-annual basis during the specified timeline. Note that additional information about individual development or career plans is provided in Module 4 of this training.

For those whose performance continues to not meet expectations, PTR policy provides for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which may in the most serious cases include a recommendation for discharge consistent with Chapter VI of The Code of the University.

Evaluation outcomes are covered further in Module 4 of this training.

Slide 8. Key Points from This Module

- UNC PTR policy is intended to support and encourage excellence.
- Each tenure-awarding institution has recently revised its policy to strengthen the PTR process and increase the effectiveness of evaluations.
- Each institution's policy takes into account financial and human resource needs for carrying out the PTR process.
- To get the most from the PTR process, participants need to understand and be comfortable with their respective roles.

Narrator:

So that concludes the overview of the training. Let's quickly list the key points from what we covered.

- The overarching purpose of the UNC PTR policy is to support and encourage excellence.
- Each UNC institution that awards tenure must develop policies for implementing a meaningful process for PTR, as they recently have done.
- When developing PTR policies, it's important to consider both the financial and human resources needed to effectively carry out the process.
- And...all individuals participating in PTR processes are expected to follow the policies and guidelines for PTR and be familiar with best practices for their roles.

OK. Let's keep these in mind as we go on to the next module, where we'll look further at who does what in PTR.

Module 2. PTR Procedural Principles

Slide 1. Module Overview

- UNC policy's broad principles for institution-level PTR implementation.
- Considerations for implementing a meaningful PTR process.
- PTR participants and roles.

Narrator:

Now that we've talked about the scope, purpose, and general process of PTR at UNC, let's get into some specifics.

In this module, we'll be discussing PTR procedural principles and considerations. And we'll talk about who's expected to be involved in the PTR process and what the individual responsibilities are.

Specifically, we'll cover:

- UNC's guiding policy principles, such as those promoting multi-tier faculty reviews as well as the importance of providing written feedback for the reviewed faculty member, along with an opportunity to respond.
- Next, considerations for ensuring an institution's PTR process is effective and that reviews are useful.
- And then the role of various participants in implementing PTR. For this, the module provides brief branching pathways for exploring the role of each participant involved in faculty evaluations.

Slide 2. Institution-Level Implementation

- ▶ **UNC Policy 400.3.3 provides broad PTR principles.**
- ▶ **UNC Guidelines 400.3.3[G] provides guidance for institution-level implementation.**
- **An institution's PTR procedures must:**
 - Provide for multi-tiered review of tenured faculty.
 - Ensure reviewed faculty member receives written feedback.
 - Include mechanism for faculty member to respond to findings.
- **An institution must establish at least three PTR assessment categories:**
 - Exceeds expectations.
 - Meets expectations.
 - Does not meet expectations.

Narrator:

Importantly, UNC policy incorporates broad principles for PTR implementation. And the accompanying guidelines were established to inform development of institution-specific policies and procedures for PTR that reflect the particular institution's mission.

Specifically, UNC policy requires that an institution's procedures provide for a multi-tiered review of tenured faculty, with different reviewers performing different roles in the PTR process—we'll touch on this in the next slide. UNC policy also requires that a faculty member under review receives written feedback based on the PTR evaluation findings. And then he or she must have an opportunity to respond to the findings.

Regarding the characterization of outcomes resulting from the PTR evaluation, UNC policy requires that constituent institutions establish at least three PTR assessment categories: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or does not meet expectations. We focus more on these categories in Module 4 of this training, which covers "outcomes."

Of course, all PTR policies and procedures must be approved by the particular institution's Board of Trustees.

Slide 3. Multi-tiered PTR

- UNC policy focuses particularly on who must be involved in the evaluation process.
 - Tenured faculty agree on a process for selecting a peer evaluation committee.
 - The department chair and college dean each also provide an evaluative review of the faculty member.
 - The provost of the constituent institution certifies all aspects of the PTR process.

Narrator:

For purposes of this module, we will focus on who UNC policy specifies must participate in PTR.

Specifically:

- Each department or academic unit will select a peer review committee by a process agreed upon by the tenured faculty in that unit;
- The department chair and college dean must also provide an evaluative review of the faculty member going through PTR. And the department chair must consult with the peer review committee in rendering this evaluation; and
- The provost of the particular institution must certify that all aspects of the PTR process for the relevant year are in compliance with UNC policy and guidelines.

Slide 4. Important PTR Process Considerations

- Essential elements of a useful and thoughtful review.
- Conducting and managing a meaningful review process.

A note about Academic Freedom: It is the policy of the University of North Carolina to support and encourage full freedom, within the law, of inquiry, discourse, teaching, research, and publication for all members of the academic staffs of the constituent institutions. (To learn more, read section 601 of the UNC Policy Manual (PDF) statement, which is available on the Resources page associated with this training.)

Narrator:

An important consideration in establishing an institution's PTR procedures is that they promote useful and thoughtful faculty reviews. To advance this objective:

- The post-tenure reviews should be "comprehensive" such that they encompass all aspects of professional performance, including teaching, and research and creative activity, and/or service. In the same sense, they should involve discussion of goals, assessment of the degree to which goals have been met, and advice for future development.
- In addition, the reviews should be "periodic," being conducted no less frequently than every 5 years.
- And finally, they should be "cumulative," showing the relationship between annual performance reviews and PTR review criteria, and including additional assessments based on all aspects of professional performance of the faculty member under review; for example, reviews undertaken to grant tenure or to decide on promotion.

Another important consideration is ensuring that the institution's PTR process is conducted and managed in a meaningful way. Procedural principles for promoting this objective include:

- Training for all participants involved in the process in advance.
- Notification provided in writing to the faculty member to be reviewed, with information about the schedule and review procedures.
- Constructive feedback provided in a positive manner with the intention of engaging the faculty member in the review process. Note that we look specifically at approaches to providing constructive feedback in Module 4 of this training.

Slide 5. Materials Submitted by Faculty Member

An institution's PTR policy might require the following:

- Chair's annual evaluations.
- Self-evaluations and/or annual performance reports.
- Dean's evaluations.
- Student evaluation summaries.
- Additional information (e.g., samples of scholarly works, grant proposals, materials illustrating service and outreach activities).

Narrator:

Another University PTR procedural principle calls for the individual institution to develop a list of materials to be submitted by the faculty member under review to his or her department chair. Of course, the materials would cover the review time frame established by the institution's policy.

The items listed on this slide could be very useful materials for the review. Again, however, it's ultimately up to the individual institution to determine what is most appropriate.

Slide 6. Role of the Faculty Member Being Evaluated

- Provide requested materials for review.
- Acknowledge receipt of written evaluations.
- Respond to written evaluations.
- Develop a plan if performance “does not meet expectations.”

Narrator:

This slide lists the typical key responsibilities of the faculty member being reviewed:

- For instance, the faculty member to be reviewed needs to provide materials requested from the peer evaluation committee.
- Later, he or she acknowledges receipt when provided written evaluations by the peer evaluation committee, the department chair, and the college dean.
- He or she is then given an opportunity to respond to the peer evaluation committee and the department chair—for example, to rebut evaluation findings. And these responses are forwarded to the college dean.
- In the case of an overall performance rating of “does not meet expectations,” the faculty member will need to work with the department chair to create a development plan for addressing the identified weaknesses. He or she also will need to help establish the plan’s timeline for achieving the stated goals.

Note that tenured faculty under review have no prerogatives in regard to the selection of the peer evaluation committee.

Slide 7. PTR Evaluation Participants & Roles in the Process

- A. Peer Evaluation Committee
- B. Department Chair/Head
- C. College/School Dean
- D. Provost of Constituent Institution

Narrator:

Each participant in the PTR evaluation process plays an integral role in providing a range of perspectives from the different levels of the academic community. Thus, while the review is primarily driven by a committee made up of faculty peers, the department head and dean each provide essential evaluative input from a more managerial viewpoint. It's also important that determinations be informed by student evaluations and that the overall process be certified each year by the institution's provost.

The slides that follow explore what the role for individual PTR participants might involve. That is, the role will vary based on a particular institution's implementation of PTR, so this module presents fairly typical examples.

PTR Participants & Roles in the Process

Slide 7A. Role of the Peer Evaluation Committee

- Convene as a committee.
- Gather information and conduct evaluation.
- Submit committee evaluation report to department chair.

Narrator:

This slide lists the typical key responsibilities of a peer evaluation committee.

That is, the committee convenes to begin the evaluation after selection of members by a process agreed upon by the tenured faculty. For obvious reasons, the faculty member being evaluated cannot be involved in that process.

The committee then gathers appropriate information, assesses its implications, and formulates a coherent evaluation of performance. Next the group compiles its findings into a report, which may include an assessment of each area of faculty performance—such as teaching, research, service—ultimately providing a rating of overall performance and an accompanying narrative justification. That is, does the faculty member’s performance “meet expectations” or “exceed expectations” and what is the basis of this rating? If the determination is “does not meet expectations,” the committee might also include specific suggestions for improvement.

Once completed, the committee provides its evaluation report to the department chair.

PTR Participants & Roles in the Process

Slide 7B. Role of the Department Chair/Head

- Appoint and orient peer reviewers.
- Consult with peer committee and conduct his/her own review.
- Provide evaluations to college dean.
- Collaborate with reviewed faculty member if a development plan is needed.

Narrator:

This slide lists the typical key responsibilities of a department chair.

For instance, the chair appoints faculty members to the committee based on the department's prescribed process and then calls them together for an orientation meeting. At about the same time, the chair provides the committee with the materials submitted by the faculty member.

At completion of the committee's work, the chair consults with the committee and then conducts his or her own review.

Ultimately, the department chair forwards to the college dean: the committee's report, his or her recommendations, and any response by the faculty member. Specifics regarding the process for submission of recommendations from the chair are established by an institution's PTR policy.

If it is agreed that the faculty member's performance does "not meet expectations," the department chair will collaborate with him or her to establish an individual development plan, typically covering 3 to 5 years. This plan must include:

- Steps designed to raise the faculty member's performance to a "meets expectations" level,
- A specified time frame in which this improvement is to occur, and
- A clear statement of consequences should performance not improve to the expected level.

PTR Participants & Roles in the Process

Slide 7C. Role of the College/School Dean

- Reviews evaluations and conducts his/her own assessment.
- Reviews faculty member development plan, when one is needed.
- Provides evaluations to the institution's provost.
- Provides annual summary of PTR outcomes to provost.

Narrator:

This slide lists the typical key responsibilities of a college dean.

For instance, the dean reviews the evaluation reports from the department chair and the evaluation committee, along with any supporting materials provided and any rebuttals submitted by the faculty member. Then the dean conducts his own assessment and rates the faculty member's overall performance. Since evaluations by the different participants in the PTR process will not always result in the same performance rating, the institution's PRT policies must include steps for addressing such situations.

Also, in situations where it is agreed that the tenured faculty member's performance does "not meet expectations," the dean reviews the development plan that was established for improving performance. If in concurrence, the dean then submits the plan to the institution's provost.

In addition, the dean provides the evaluation reports and materials to the provost.

Then, each year, the dean reports to the provost on PTR outcomes.

On occasion, the faculty member under review will be the department chair. In those situations, the college dean might fulfill the PTR responsibilities of the department chair.

PTR Participants & Roles in the Process

Slide 7D. Role of the Institution's Provost

- Reviews dean's assessment and related materials.
- Approves PTR determination.
- Recommends sanctions for reviewed faculty member, when called for.
- Certifies the PTR process for the relevant year.

Narrator:

This slide lists the typical key responsibilities of the provost of the constituent institution.

That's correct, at this level of the process, the provost would not likely be expected to confer with the peer evaluation committee. The other items, however, are typical responsibilities of the provost.

For instance, the provost reviews the college dean's report, along with any related reports or development plans provided.

The provost then reviews for approval the evaluation and its overall determination on performance.

For situations where the PTR determination is "does not meet expectations," the provost may recommend sanctions for a faculty member after assessing PTR outcomes and/or progress in regard to the performance improvement plan.

More broadly, the provost certifies that all aspects of the PTR process for the relevant year are in compliance with UNC policy and guidelines.

Remember, however, that specifics on the provost's role in reviewing evaluation reports is established by an institution's PTR policy.

Slide 8. Key Points from This Module

- University-wide requirements provide broad principles for institutions to follow.
- BOG provides guidelines for establishing a meaningful process.
- Individual institutions work out procedures and participant roles.

Narrator:

There you have it! That concludes the module on PTR procedural principles. Let's quickly list the key points from what we covered.

- UNC's guiding policy principles address fundamental PTR considerations. These include establishing procedures for multi-tier faculty reviews, providing constructive written feedback for the reviewed faculty member, and establishing a mechanism for responding to findings. Another policy principle calls for establishing at least three PTR assessment categories: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, and does not meet expectations.
- And the guidelines from the Board of Governors promote the importance of PTR evaluations being comprehensive, periodic, and cumulative.
- Also, it's left to the individual institutions to establish specifics on the role of the peer evaluation committee, the department chair, the college dean, and the provost. In this module we explored fairly typical examples of participant responsibilities.

OK. Let's keep these points in mind as we go on to the next module, where we'll talk about establishing standards to be used for conducting PTR evaluations.

Module 3. PTR Standards

Slide 1. Module Overview

- General characteristics of evaluation standards.
- Considerations regarding standards for the three main categories of PTR evaluation:
 - Teaching
 - Research and creative activity
 - Service

Narrator:

In the preceding module, we addressed PTR procedures and talked about who participates in the review. Now we'll talk about the *basis* for conducting reviews—specifically, the standards (or criteria) for evaluating the performance of tenured faculty.

So, this module will cover the following topics relevant to PTR evaluation standards with a focus on useful examples:

- First, a few important general characteristics of PTR evaluation standards,
- Then we touch on aspects of standards for the three main categories of PTR evaluation, which are: Teaching; Research and creative activity; and, lastly, Service.

Slide 2. Key Considerations for Evaluation Standards

- Must reflect the discipline and interests of the particular academic department or unit.
- Must focus on professional competence, while being flexible enough to acknowledge individual career trajectories.
- Must be fair in terms of establishing reasonable expectations.

Narrator:

Importantly, in the same sense that PTR procedures should reflect the context of the particular institution's mission, PTR evaluation standards must reflect what is appropriate to the particular academic department or unit.

A department's basic standard for evaluation should be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with and assigned to his or her position. With this in mind, the department's standards need to be flexible enough to allow evaluators to recognize variations between faculty in individual career trajectories and in the ways the individual being reviewed promotes excellence through his or her teaching, research and creative activity, and/or service. And, of course, evaluation criteria must not infringe on the accepted standards of academic freedom.

Further, standards need to be fair in terms of establishing reasonable expectations that are consistent with the criteria used in other types of faculty reviews, such as annual performance reviews. In regard to this, when a tenured faculty member prepares multi-year directional goals, which are subsequently approved by the department chair, it must be evident that the faculty member is aware and attentive to the PTR standards that will be used by evaluators.

OK. Let's move along and talk about PTR standards for evaluating proficiency in teaching.

Slide 3. Evaluation of Teaching

Evaluation Measure 1: Pedagogical Content Knowledge	<i>Evidence includes:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer Review of Teaching Materials & Direct Observation • Statement on Teaching Currency
Evaluation Measure 2: Professional Aspects of Teaching	<i>Evidence includes:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer Review of Teaching Materials & Direct Observation • Student Assessment of Instruction
Evaluation Measure 3: Student Response to Instruction	<i>Evidence includes:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer Review of Teaching Materials & Direct Observation • Student Assessment of Instruction

Narrator:

Faculty whose responsibilities include teaching should at minimum demonstrate proficiency in advancing the teaching mission of their academic unit. As such, assessment criteria established by an academic department would likely include, for example: mastery of instructional subject matter, effective use of chosen pedagogical approaches, effective organization and presentation of course materials, use of meaningful assessment methods, and timely, efficient, and accessible communications with students regarding course expectations, student concerns, and student learning outcomes.

Because the assessment of teaching can be complex, however, it may need to entail the use of a number of evaluation methods as determined by the particular academic department.

The matrix on this slide presents the evaluation measures and focus of supporting evidence for the PTR evaluation of teaching provided in the general approach guidance established at UNC’s Western Carolina University.

For this approach, WCU defines teaching excellence as the facilitation of engaged and ambitious learning. And it recognizes that even among diverse instructional settings, effective teaching incorporates common aspects that can be evaluated, including: pedagogical content knowledge; professional aspects of teaching; and student response to instruction.

On the next few slide, we’ll look more closely at the approach used at WCU for the PTR evaluation of teaching.

Evaluation of Teaching

Slide 3A. Pedagogical Content Knowledge: Characterization

- Remain current in their fields.
- Know how students learn.
- Recognize what prior information, including misconceptions, students bring to their courses.

Lee Shulman (1987) *Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform*. Harvard Educational Review: April 1987, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 1-23. Available at <http://people.ucsc.edu/~ktellez/shulman.pdf>

Narrator:

First we look at *pedagogical content knowledge* to characterize it generally as a teaching evaluation measure. This slide presents what are considered the key characteristics of effective teachers in this context.

What's important about these, is that effective teachers know how to combine these attributes to create teaching acts that lead to student learning. It was Lee Shulman—a past president of the American Educational Research Association—in his 1987 paper, who described this combination as “pedagogical content knowledge” in order to distinguish it from mere content knowledge or mere pedagogical proficiency. (You may want to visit the journal article referenced on this slide.)

An instructor's pedagogical content knowledge is reflected in the teaching acts that represent a discipline's central concepts, skills, and recent advances through a variety of means, including classroom explanations, assignments, and other course requirements. Teachers become more effective as they repeatedly engage in these teaching acts and find out what is easiest and most difficult for their students, and then modify their teaching approach accordingly.

Teachers should be continually evaluating their instructional approach by asking themselves, for instance:

- “What am I doing to help my students understand the most important material in my field?”
and
- “How have I changed my teaching practices to help students understand the central concepts, skills, and advancements for the courses I teach?”

Evaluation of Teaching

Slide 3B. Pedagogical Content Knowledge: Evidence

- **Peer review of teaching materials.** Specifically, the portfolio of materials a faculty member submits should include such items as syllabi, assignments, reading lists, study guides, exams and quizzes, classroom exercises, and self-evaluations.
- **Direct observation of teaching.** Peer reports may include observations on how the instructor has demonstrated pedagogical content knowledge in the instructional design.
- **Statements on teaching currency.** Examples include:
 - A statement by the faculty member discussing how instruction has changed or developed in relation to his/her discipline.
 - A peer evaluation may address the extent to which a faculty member's pedagogy is appropriate to the discipline.

Narrator:

Now we consider *evidence* to support pedagogical content knowledge. This slide presents typical examples of evidence.

Regarding peer review of teaching materials, each department should designate a committee of at least two faculty colleagues—exclusive of the department head—to review and evaluate teaching materials prepared by the faculty member being evaluated. In small departments, reviewers may need to be selected from outside the department. Also, each department should develop a protocol to guide the committee in reviewing teaching materials. Similarly, each department should develop guidance on conducting peer observation of teaching.

Evaluation of Teaching

Slide 3C. Professional Aspects of Teaching: Characterization & Evidence

- Holding classes and making suitable use of class time.
- Making instruction-related materials available.
- Providing clear instructions.
- Providing appropriate and timely feedback.
- Providing regular information regarding progress.
- Responding appropriately and in a timely manner to student requests.

Narrator:

OK. Now let's take a look at *professional aspects* of teaching to characterize it generally as an evaluation measure. Importantly, effective teaching is more than mere class management. Rather, effectiveness also relies heavily on the ability to perform the required administrative and professional functions associated with instruction.

This slide presents relevant functions considered important characteristics of effective teachers in this context.

As with pedagogical content knowledge, evidence for this measure comes in part from peer review of teaching materials and peer direct observation. Additional evidence of professional aspects of teaching typically come from feedback provided on Student Assessments of Instruction, or SAIs, where students may include comments such as:

- 'My instructor is well prepared for class meetings.'
- 'Feedback to me provided by my instructor clearly indicates my standing in this course.'

Regarding student assessments, tenured faculty are required to use SAIs and report on them during at least one semester each academic year. An exception is that faculty standing for promotion or reappointment may be required to conduct more frequent SAIs, as prescribed by the institution's provost. Also keep in mind that SAIs must be conducted using forms and procedures that have been departmentally approved and that include one of the institution-wide assessment forms approved by the Faculty Senate.

Evaluation of Teaching

Slide 3D. Student Response to Instruction: Characterization & Evidence

Students place a high value on:

- Intellectual engagement, enthusiasm.
- Course organization and clarity.
- Availability of teachers for consults.

Narrator:

Lastly, let's take a quick look at *student response to instruction* to characterize it generally as a teaching evaluation measure.

Students can play an important role in PTR teaching evaluations, since they offer a unique perspective on certain components of teaching effectiveness. Examples of what students particularly value in a teacher include:

- Intellectual engagement, enthusiasm, and passion for course content.
- Course organization and clarity.
- Availability of teachers for consults.

Also, it has been found that the extent to which a student feels respected and shares a sense of rapport with the instructor correlates with teaching effectiveness.

As with professional aspects of teaching, evidence for this measure comes from peer review of teaching materials, peer direct observation, and from feedback provided on SAIs.

Evaluation of Teaching

Slide 3E. PTR Resources: Example Documents

- Evaluation Criteria for Teaching (College of Arts and Sciences, Texas A&M International, 2011)
- Protocol for Peer Review of Teaching, including Course Document Review Form and Classroom Observation Form (Department of Communication, NC State University Office of Faculty Development)

Narrator:

To conclude our discussion about the PTR evaluation of teaching, we reference a few relevant example documents, which are available on the Resources page associated with this training. However, for specifics on your institution's process for evaluating teaching, you should refer to the institution's policies and procedures.

Slide 4. Evaluation of Research and Creative Activity: Expectation

- To engage in significant research or creative scholarly activities.
- Covers all forms of discovery and integration of knowledge.

Narrator:

A second main PTR evaluation category for which department standards need to be established addresses *research and creative activity*. All tenured faculty members are expected to engage in significant research or creative scholarly activities as appropriate to their fields or disciplines, their continuing professional growth, and the mission of the University.

Research and creative activities include all forms of discovery and integration of knowledge such as the solution of practical problems; critical analyses; the organization, creation, analysis, and dissemination of knowledge resources; and the creation and performance or exhibition of works of art and their public dissemination.

Evaluation of Research and Creative Activity

Slide 4A. Evaluation Criteria

- Broad considerations.

- Particular criteria.

- Additional considerations:
 - Must be rigorous.
 - Must be clear and fully explained to PTR participants.
 - Must be appropriate for the rank and standing of faculty under review.

Narrator:

For this category, evaluation standards should be concerned broadly with aspects of the faculty member's engagement that advance knowledge, support teaching, apply innovation and entrepreneurship, and promote the application of knowledge for the benefit of society.

More particularly, the criteria should focus on contributions to the relevant field or discipline, including interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and collaborative work, the quality of the work, and its significance or impact.

The evaluation also should include the continuity, range, focus, and aggregation of productive work as appropriate to the field or discipline, with particular emphasis on accomplishments since appointment or the last promotion.

Evaluation of Research and Creative Activity

Slide 4B. PTR Resources: Examples

- Evaluation Matrix for Scholarship, Research, and Professional Development (Texas A&M International University)
- Evaluation Criteria (Texas A&M International University, Fine and Performing Arts department)

Narrator:

To conclude our discussion about the PTR evaluation of research and creative activity, we reference a few relevant example documents, which are available on the Resources page associated with this training. Again, however, for specifics on your institution's process for evaluating research and creative activity, you should refer to the institution's policies and procedures.

Slide 5. Evaluation of Service: Expectation

Purpose of service activities:

- Enables UNC to carry out its broader mission.
- Advances forms of discovery and integration of knowledge.
- Engages external communities and constituencies.

Narrator:

The third main PTR evaluation category for which department standards need to be established addresses *service*. All tenured faculty members are expected to engage in service, with increasing involvement at department and constituent institution levels at higher ranks.

Service embraces activities that:

- Sustain the University and enable it to carry out its broader mission,
- Contribute to the function and effectiveness of the faculty member's profession and discipline, and
- Reach out to external communities and constituencies. These can include government agencies, business, private for-profit and not-for-profit organizations, and arts communities, where academic knowledge intersects with practical affairs and problem solving.

In addition to service at the institution, faculty members often contribute to their professions and disciplines through involvement and leadership in professional organizations, interdisciplinary activities, community service, and community-engaged outreach. Each is a legitimate and important example of service.

Evaluation of Service

Slide 5A. Evaluation Criteria

Results-based assessment of:

- Descriptions of service.
- Assessment of outcomes.
- Recognition and appraisals.
- Additional considerations:
 - Must be demonstrably useful to the institutional mission.
 - Must not compromise other faculty responsibilities, particularly those related to teaching and to research or creative activities.

Narrator:

For this category, evaluations should focus on scope and results by reviewing descriptions of service activities; assessment of outcomes related to service; honors, awards, or letters of recognition; and self-appraisals.

Evaluation of Service

Slide 5B. PTR Resources: Examples of Evaluation Criteria

Note: Definitions and criteria for service vary based on the type of institution; for example, land-grant universities often link service with extension and engagement activities related to their mission.

- University of Wisconsin-River Falls
- University of Kansas, Department of Geography
- University of Colorado Denver, School of Dentistry
- University of Alaska Anchorage
- NC State University

Narrator:

To conclude our discussion about the PTR evaluation of service, we reference a few relevant example documents, which are available on the Resources page associated with this training. Keep in mind that for specifics on your institution's process for evaluating service, you should refer to the institution's policies and procedures.

Slide 6. Key Points from This Module

- PTR standards must reflect the discipline and interests of the particular academic department or unit.
- Teaching faculty must be evaluated for their proficiency in this role.
- Tenured faculty are expected to engage in significant research or creative scholarly activities.
- Tenured faculty members are expected to engage in service.

Narrator:

So that concludes the module on the need to establish standards for evaluating tenured faculty. Let's quickly list the key points from what we covered.

- PTR evaluation standards must reflect what is appropriate to the particular academic department or unit. And, while the criteria used must be rigorous, they also need to be flexible enough to accommodate a range of academic pursuits within the department.
- Faculty whose responsibilities include teaching should at minimum demonstrate proficiency in advancing the teaching mission of their academic unit. Evaluation measures often include a combination of such factors as pedagogical content knowledge; professional aspects of teaching; and student response to instruction.
- Evaluation standards for research and creative activities should be concerned with, for instance, the extent to which the faculty member's engagement in this area advances knowledge, supports teaching, and/or applies innovative techniques.
- Evaluations standards for service should focus on aspects of scope and results by reviewing descriptions of service activities; assessment of outcomes related to service; honors, awards, or letters of recognition; and self-appraisals.

OK. Let's move along to the next module that briefly looks at PTR outcomes.

Module 4. PTR Outcomes

Slide 1. Module Overview

- Follow-up actions based on PTR outcomes.
- Considerations for providing constructive feedback to faculty.
- What to include in development plans.

Narrator:

Now let's talk a bit about PTR outcomes, which are the results of the review based on application of the evaluation standards covered in the preceding module.

Specifically, in this module, we'll cover:

- Actions that might ensue from a PTR outcome determination.
- Suggested approaches for providing constructive feedback to faculty members under review.
- And, what's typically included in a development plan for a faculty member whose performance is found in the PTR to be below expectations.

Slide 2. PTR Actions Based on Outcomes

- What happens if:
 - a faculty member 'exceeds expectations'?
 - a faculty member 'meets expectations'?
 - a faculty member 'does not meet expectations'?

Narrator:

As discussed in Module 2 on PTR procedural principles, UNC policy requires that constituent institutions establish at least three PTR assessment categories for characterizing outcomes resulting from their PTR evaluations:

- Exceeds expectations,
- Meets expectations, and
- Does not meet expectations.

Using these outcome designations, the PTR process can highlight outstanding performance by faculty members as well as identify faculty members whose performance leaves room for some degree of improvement.

Specifically, when the outcome of the PTR is that a faculty member 'exceeds expectations,' the evaluation results may provide supporting evidence for a university award and/or merit pay decision to recognize exemplary faculty performance. When funding is not available to recognize exemplary performance through salary adjustments, other alternatives of recognition should be considered. Some suggestions might be: travel grants to attend professional conferences, course release time to focus on research, or public recognition.

When the PTR outcome is 'meets expectations,' the process may also identify specific areas in which the faculty member can improve by providing recommendations in the written evaluation.

Then, when the evaluation determines that the faculty member under review 'does not meet expectations,' it indicates that his or her overall performance reflects substantial deficiencies. In such situations, the written evaluation should specify the shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member's assigned duties. And then, based on these findings, a development plan for the underperforming faculty member needs to be established. We'll talk about that in a moment, after we touch on suggestions for providing constructive feedback.

Slide 3. Constructive PTR Feedback: Approach

- **Be descriptive and open ended; not overly judgmental.** Examples:
 - **Good:** "Your department document and your stated goals for these last 4 years on scholarship indicate that you should have published your 'in progress' research this year. I don't see any indication of your having submitted any of this ongoing work. What has prevented you from meeting your stated goals and how can I assist you?"
 - **Bad:** "Your scholarship is at an unacceptable level. Too late to fix that now."
- **Be specific about issues and recommendations.** Examples:
 - **Good:** "Your service record indicates that you served on one departmental committee over the last 4 years. The department document indicates that at your level, you should be serving on at least four committees, one of which should be at the departmental level. Was there a problem in getting onto these external committees and how can we help you moving forward?"
 - **Bad:** "You are not doing the required amount of service and are not serving the department or university well."
- **Focus on behavior patterns that can be modified.** Examples:
 - **Good:** "I am pleased to see that you have provided regular written feedback to students in your online classes. The student comments over the past few years indicate that they seek more in-depth feedback in a timely manner. Are these valid concerns? How are you addressing this perception?"
 - **Bad:** "You have to be better at providing in-depth feedback in your class. This comment has been appearing in your SAls for the last 4 years and you have done nothing to improve."

Narrator:

When the PTR evaluation finds that the faculty member under review needs to improve performance in some areas, it's important to provide feedback that's constructive for promoting professional growth and that's delivered in an appropriate tone. A few considerations for doing this effectively include:

- Be descriptive about concerns, but not overly judgmental in tone to avoid prompting a defensive response. Ask open-ended questions.
- Be as specific as possible about issues and recommendations to avoid misunderstandings about where to focus improvement efforts.
- Emphasize behavior patterns and their effect, rather than focusing on personal traits that might be less easily modified.

This slide presents examples of good and not-as-good feedback statements.

Slide 4. Constructive PTR Feedback: Purpose

- Clarify expectations.
- Identify opportunities to improve.
- Provide encouragement.

David Nicol and Debra Macfarlane-Dick (2005) *Rethinking Formative Assessment in HE: A theoretical model and seven principles of good feedback practice*. Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. Available at <http://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/docs/workshop/rethinking-formative-assessment-a-theoretical-model-and-seven-principles-of-good-feedback-practice-paper.pdf>

Narrator:

And the purposes of providing constructive PTR feedback to a faculty member include:

- Helping to clarify what constitutes good performance.
- Providing opportunities to close the gap between current and desired performance.
- Encouraging self-assessment/reflection, positive motivational beliefs/self-esteem, and dialogue on needed improvements.

Note that this information draws from the reference shown on this slide.

Slide 5. Development Plans

- A list of the faculty member's primary responsibilities.
- Description of achievements and shortcomings.
- Description of improvements to be accomplished.
- Resources to be provided.
- Consequences of failure to attain the goals.

Narrator:

Earlier—in Module 2—we mentioned that a faculty member whose performance “does not meet expectations” based on the PTR evaluation would need to work with the department chair to create a development plan and timeline for addressing the identified weaknesses. The dean would then review the plan and—if in concurrence—would submit it to the institution's provost. Here we'll expand a bit on these plans and what typically is included.

Faculty development plans should be individualized and flexible, taking into account the faculty member's intellectual interests, abilities, and career stage, as well as needs of the constituent institution.

The development plan should describe changes, if any, to be made in the faculty member's teaching, research, and/or service responsibilities and establish clear goals. Specifically, the plan should include:

- A list of the faculty member's primary responsibilities;
- Descriptions of achievements and shortcomings;
- Descriptions of improvement goals to be accomplished, with steps identified for achieving goals and with indicators of goal attainment defined—which should include target dates within an overall timeframe (typically 3 to 5 years);
- Resources to be provided to support improvement efforts; and
- A statement on the consequences of failure to attain the goals within the specified timeframe.

On at least a semiannual basis, the department head and peer evaluation committee should assess the faculty member's progress and provide written feedback, which should be copied to the dean and provost.

The consequences for failure of the faculty member to improve performance as mapped out in the plan may range from suspension of pay raises to—in the most extreme cases—reduction in rank, temporary suspension of employment, or termination of employment, in keeping with the Board of Governors' and particular institution's policies.

6. Key Points from This Module

- PTR outcomes drive follow-up actions.
- To be constructive, feedback from the PTR needs to be explicit as well as encouraging in tone.
- Development plans need to focus on what performance issues to address and by when.

Narrator:

So that concludes the module on PTR outcomes. Let's recap quickly before moving on to the final module of the training.

- We revisited the three outcome categories that UNC policy requires each institution to include in its PTR approach and then considered follow-up actions from the assessment, whether it involves recognizing exemplary performance or establishing goals to address performance that's underwhelming.
- We also talked about the importance of providing constructive feedback that fully describes the performance issues to be addressed, focuses on behavior that can be reasonably modified, and strikes an encouraging and supportive tone.
- And we finished up by talking about what should be included in development plans for faculty that 'did not meet expectations.' Importantly, the plan should include descriptions of shortcomings in the context of the faculty member's responsibilities, identification of improvements that need to be accomplished, and a timeline for doing so.

OK. Onward to the brief final module on oversight and maintenance of the PTR process.

Module 5. PTR Oversight and Maintenance

Slide 1. Module Overview

- Key aspects of oversight and maintenance:
 - At the institution level.
 - At the University level.

Narrator:

OK. Here we are at the last module of the training. And it's a very brief one in which we'll wrap up by touching on who does what to keep the PTR process operating as intended—that is to say, resulting in meaningful assessments of tenured faculty performance.

So, we'll quickly cover oversight and maintenance of PTR at both the constituent institution and University levels.

Note that following the last page of this module is the training's Attestation of Completion form.

Slide 2. Institution-Level Oversight & Maintenance

- Provost's office must regularly certify the PTR process and occasionally meet with PTR participants.
- Each institution should provide training and orientation sessions to PTR participants as needed.
- Each institution should make information resources readily available.

Narrator:

Key aspects of ongoing institution-level oversight and maintenance of the PTR process include:

- The institution's provost must certify that all aspects of the PTR process for the particular year are in compliance with policy and guidelines—importantly, for example, that all PTR participants have been trained in the process and that implementation of PTR is consistent with the annual performance review process. In addition, the Office of the Provost should occasionally meet with department heads, peer evaluation committees, and faculty who will be evaluated to review policies, procedures, and answer questions.
- Also, each institution should provide training and orientation sessions to PTR participants as needed; for instance, training for new faculty or new department chairs.
- And, individual institutions should make information resources readily available, such as sample faculty-evaluation portfolios at, for example, the faculty development center.

Slide 3. University-Level Oversight & Maintenance

- UNC President's office will review and approve institution-level PTR policies.
- UNC General Administration will provide ongoing support for training of participants in the PTR process.
- UNC General Administration will regularly conduct institution-level reviews of compliance with training and process implementation requirements.

Narrator:

Key aspects of ongoing University-level oversight and maintenance of the PTR process include:

- The UNC President's office will review and approve the PTR policies of each constituent institution.
- UNC General Administration is supporting the training of participants in the PTR process with this online training and will be providing as-needed guidance to institutions' Academic Affairs or Human Resources offices.
- Also, UNC General Administration will evaluate institution-level compliance with training and process implementation requirements on a three-year cycle.

Slide 4. Key Points from This Module

- Provost's office must regularly certify the PTR process and occasionally meet with PTR participants.
- UNC President's office will approve institution-level PTR policies, and UNC GA will provide ongoing training support and oversight reviews.

Narrator:

That's all for this module. A quick recap is:

- The provost's office of each institution must regularly certify the PTR process and occasionally meet with PTR participants. Also, each institution should provide training and make informational resources available.
- At the University level, the UNC President's office must approve institutions' PTR policies. And UNC General Administration will support training and will evaluate institutions' PTR implementations.

So that's it. This concludes the online PTR training! We hope the information covered will support conducting meaningful post-tenure reviews at your institution and help make you an informed participant in the process. Keep in mind that this online training is intended to serve as a resource that you can return to for reminders about specific topics.

The page that immediately follows provides the Attestation of Completion for this training, which is to be signed and submitted to your Department Chair. You may also want to keep a copy on file for your records.

Thanks for your time and attention. And congratulations!



ATTESTATION OF COMPLETION
for training on
Conducting Post-Tenure Review (PTR) at UNC Institutions

By selecting this checkbox and signing below, I attest that I have completed and will follow the principles and processes explained in the modules (listed below) of this online training.

Module 1: Introduction to PTR: Scope, Purpose, and Process

Module 2: PTR Procedural Principles

Module 3: PTR Standards

Module 4: PTR Outcomes

Module 5: PTR Oversight and Maintenance

I further understand that the following resources are available to me at the Resources page associated with this training:

- The online training modules and related resources (e.g., sample documents).
- UNC Policy 400.3.3
- UNC Guidelines 400.3.3[G]
- My constituent institution’s PTR policy.

College/School/Department _____

Participant’s Name _____

Participant’s Signature _____