

Policies of the University of North Texas at Dallas	Chapter 06
06.024 Review of Tenured Faculty	Faculty Affairs

Policy Statement. An academic institution’s strength lies in its faculty. The University of North Texas at Dallas (UNT Dallas or UNTD) expects faculty to provide high quality contributions to the mission of the University, encompassing a holistic review of the three domains of teaching and student success; research, scholarly and creative activities; and service and public engagement; as well as administration, after faculty have earned tenure.

Application of Policy. Tenured faculty.

Definitions.

1. **Administration.** “Administration” means any assignment other than teaching, research/scholarly or creative activities, and service and public engagement that entails duties relating to the operation of a program, institute, center, or like assignment whether the assignment qualifies as set out in section 51.948 of the Texas Education Code.
2. **Professional Development Plan.** “Professional development plan” (PDP) means an agreement indicating how specific deficiencies in a faculty member’s performance will be remedied. The generation of the plan is a collaborative effort between a Faculty Professional Development Committee (FPDC) and a faculty member. PDPs are approved by the unit administrator, dean, and provost prior to implementation.
3. **Unit.** “Unit” means an academic program, department or division under the administration of a UNT Dallas official with responsibilities for personnel actions related to the unit.
4. **Unit Administrator.** “Unit administrator” means a UNT Dallas official with tenure and responsibilities for the management and supervision of a unit.
5. **Faculty Professional Development Committee.** “Faculty Professional Development Committee” (FPDC) means a group of tenured faculty members comprised of individuals who do not hold an administrative assignment in the faculty member’s college/school.
6. **Unsatisfactory Performance.** “Unsatisfactory performance” means the failure to sustain contributions in the domains of teaching and student success, research/scholarly or creative activities, and service and public engagement; continued or repeated substantial neglect of professional responsibilities; or incompetence or refusal to carry out duties that are part of the assigned workload. Examples of unsatisfactory performance include, but are not limited to, failure to

meet classes, refusal to teach classes within one's area of expertise, or failure or refusal to participate in scholarly activities, service, or administrative activities when these responsibilities are part of the assigned workload. Refusal or inability to follow reasonable guidance or other university policies intended to correct unsatisfactory performance also may be considered when determining whether a faculty member will be placed on a Performance Development Plan (PDP).

Procedures and Responsibilities.

The review of tenured faculty is designed to support faculty development and sustained, holistic effectiveness in the domains after tenure is awarded. It is also designed to support the University in ensuring its faculty are meeting the requirements of evaluation. A review is required by Texas Education Code 51.942. In addition, reviews occurring after tenure must always protect academic freedom as outlined in UNTD Policy 06.001, *Academic Freedom and Responsibility*.

I. General Guidelines.

- A. Faculty members are expected to earn evaluations of at least sustained contributions in the domains of teaching and student success, research/scholarly or creative activities, and service and public engagement, and administration, when applicable, after being awarded tenure.
- B. The review is performed at a minimum of every five (5) years; however, the Unit Administrator may initiate a review after two consecutive years of unsatisfactory annual evaluations and must initiate a review after three consecutive years of unsatisfactory annual evaluations
- C. A faculty member who is determined to be performing unsatisfactory shall be referred to the Faculty Performance Development Committee (FPDC). The FPDC will have 30 days upon notification to evaluate whether the faculty member is performing unsatisfactory. A faculty member who receives a review of unsatisfactory shall be placed on a Professional Development Plan (PDP) created by the FPDC. Upon determination of unsatisfactory performance, the FPDC will have 30 days to create and disseminate the PDP to the faculty member, Unit Administrator, Dean and Provost.
- D. Numerical scores and rankings within a unit during an annual performance evaluation are not necessarily indicative of unsatisfactory performance. Failure to publish or secure external funding in a given year does not in itself imply unsatisfactory performance in scholarship. Negative teaching evaluations in themselves do not imply unsatisfactory performance in teaching.

II. Unit Criteria.

- A. The tenured faculty of each unit, in collaboration with the Dean, is responsible for developing written workload-based performance criteria for the review of tenured faculty, and for reviewing the criteria no fewer than every five (5) years. Each department-level unit's criteria must be consistent with those of the college/school and University policy.

- B. The Dean and Provost must approve all unit criteria and ensure the criteria are sufficiently flexible to allow for differences in academic disciplines.
- C. The Dean will provide the approved criteria to each tenured faculty member.
- D. The Unit Administrator is responsible for ensuring review criteria are followed.

Responsible Party: Faculty, Unit Administrator, Dean, Provost, Faculty Performance Development Committee

III. Guidelines for Performance Development.

A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review by the FPDC shall be placed on a Professional Development Plan (PDP). The faculty member will be required to meet with the unit administrator to identify barriers to sustained effectiveness and outline steps to remedy the deficiencies before the member is placed on a PDP.

- A. The PDP is initiated with the appointment of a Faculty Performance Development Committee (“Committee”) consisting of tenured faculty only. The Committee shall be comprised of a five (5) tenured faculty members. One (1) member selected by the faculty member under review, from within the UNT System, one (1) appointed by the Dean of the faculty member’s college/school in consultation with the unit administrator; two (2) members appointed by Faculty Alliance with advisement from an open forum; and a member (1) appointed by the Provost from outside the faculty member’s college/school. The Provost may appoint members to serve on the Committee if the faculty member under review or Dean fail to identify a member in a timely manner or if any of the selected members must be removed.
- B. The Committee, in consultation with the faculty member, will develop a written, individualized, and clear PDP that is intended to facilitate professional development and remedy all deficiencies noted in the review. The PDP will:
 - 1. Identify specific deficiency(ies) to be addressed;
 - 2. Identify factors that impeded or may have impeded the ability or opportunity to sustain holistic effectiveness in the area or areas evaluated as unsatisfactory;
 - 3. Identify institutional resources available to address the identified deficiency(ies);
 - 4. Identify specific goals or outcomes intended to demonstrate that the noted deficiency(ies) have been corrected;
 - 5. Describe the activities to be undertaken to achieve agreed-upon outcomes;
 - 6. Articulate the criteria for assessing progress toward the agreed-upon

goals or outcomes;

7. Identify metrics to assess progress; and

8. Establish timelines and milestones for evaluating progress.

C. The PDP must be signed by the unit administrator, Dean, and Provost, and communicated to the faculty member in writing prior to its implementation. The Committee will monitor the faculty member's progress, provide mentorship as needed, and submit an annual report to the unit administrator with a copy to the faculty member.

Responsible Party: Unit Administrator, Dean, Provost, Faculty Performance Development Committee

IV. Removal from the PDP. A faculty member may be on a PDP for no more than two (2) academic years. At the end of each year, the Committee will determine whether the faculty has achieved the outcomes identified in the plan.

A. If the FPDC determines the faculty member has successfully completed the PDP, it shall submit a report to the unit administrator, Dean, and the Provost recommending the faculty member be removed from the plan.

Responsible Party: Unit Administrator, Dean, Provost, Faculty Performance Development Committee

V. Failure to Complete the PDP. A faculty member may be on a PDP for no more than two (2) academic years. At the end of each year, the FPDC Committee will determine whether the faculty has achieved the outcomes identified in the plan.

A. If the Committee determines the agreed upon outcomes have not been achieved, the Committee will submit a written report of the deficiencies to the faculty member by the end of the first year. The Committee will also provide the report to the Unit Administrator, Dean, and Provost.

B. If the Committee determines that the agreed upon outcomes have not been achieved at the end of the second year, it will submit a written report to the Unit Administrator identifying the reason(s) for its determination.

C. Upon receipt of the report from the Committee, the unit administrator may request additional information or clarification from the Committee and, once satisfied with the completeness of the report, the unit administrator will provide the final report to the Dean with a copy to the faculty member.

D. Based on the final report, the Dean will provide a recommendation to the Provost on whether the faculty member's tenure should be revoked and

employment terminated.

- E. Upon receipt of the final report and recommendation, the Provost will determine whether to recommend the revocation of tenure and termination of employment, taking into account the faculty member's record and all annual reviews.

Responsible Party: Unit Administrator, Dean, Provost, Faculty Performance Development Committee

VI. Grievance.

- A. A faculty member who disputes the Committee's final report or the Provost's recommendation to revoke tenure and terminate employment may submit a grievance in accordance with the UNT Dallas Policy 6.017 *Faculty Grievance*. The grievance may be based on any reason related to the faculty member's evaluation, including but not limited to fairness, substantive or procedural grounds, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.
- B. A faculty member who is the subject of a recommendation by the Provost to revoke tenure and terminate employment on the basis of an evaluation conducted under this policy shall be given the opportunity to participate in mediation before initiation of the grievance process as required by Regents Rule 06.1100 and section 51.942 of the Texas Education Code.

Responsible Party: Faculty Member

References and Cross-references.

- Texas Education Code 51.948, Restrictions on Contracts with Administrators
- Texas Education Code, 51.942, Post-Tenure Review
- UNTD Policy 06.001, Academic Freedom and Academic Responsibility
- UNTD Policy 06.002, Academic Appointments and Titles
- UNTD Policy 06.007, Academic Workload
- UNTD Policy 6.017, Faculty Grievance
- UNT Regents Rule 06.902, Faculty Research and Creative Activity
- UNT Regents Rule 06.1101, Evaluation of Tenure

Approved: 5/15/2020

Effective: 06/01/2020

Revised: N/A