

Policies of the University of North Texas Health Science Center	Chapter 06 – Faculty Affairs
6.004 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty	

Policy Statement. The University of North Texas Health Science Center (UNTHSC) is committed to the consistent and comprehensive review of tenured faculty members in the areas of teaching, research, patient care, and service. The performance evaluation of tenured faculty is intended to promote continued academic professional development and peer-coordinated professional improvement to meet or exceed performance norms.

Application of Policy. Tenured faculty.

Definitions

1. **Tenured Faculty.** “Tenured Faculty” refers to faculty who have been conferred tenure by the UNT System Board of Regents. “Tenured Faculty” does not include faculty with administrative duties of 0.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) or above.
2. **Deficient Performance.** Deficient performance means performance that has fallen below the acceptable “outstanding” and “quality” standards of performance within assigned areas of teaching, research, patient care and service over a period of time.

Procedures and Responsibilities

1. **General Guidelines**

- a. Tenured faculty are expected to perform proficiently in teaching; research; patient care; and service throughout their career.
- b. Modifications to work assignments may be expected as a career changes. A decrease in expectation in one category should be matched by a concomitant increase in load expectations in another category. However, volume of work does not equate to quality performance.
- c. A tenured faculty member will be provided notice of the timing and scope of the evaluation, and the opportunity to provide documentation during the evaluation process. Additionally, before a faculty member may be subject to termination based on a deficient evaluation, a written notice of deficiencies will be provided and an opportunity for appeal.

- d. A faculty member may be subject to revocation of tenure or other appropriate disciplinary action if incompetency, neglect of duty, or other good cause is determined to be present.

2. Annual Evaluations

- a. The Office of Faculty Affairs will annually set the cycle and process for performance evaluations. Each department or college will have established criteria for evaluating tenured faculty performance in an annual review. These criteria are published and made available on the Faculty Affairs website.
- b. Rating categories for annual evaluations will be utilized to provide feedback to faculty. The rating categories for faculty performance will be outstanding, quality, or deficient in accordance with college standards.
- c. Faculty performance that is outstanding in two of the general areas of teaching, research, and service (including patient care), and quality rating in a third area will be noted as proficient in the evaluation. The evaluation will state the basis for the rating in accordance with the criteria. Faculty evaluations that are deemed deficient in one or more areas will be reported to the dean.
- d. Annual evaluations rated as deficient in one or more areas will require either a "Periodic Peer Review" or "Professional Improvement Review" at the discretion of the dean.

Responsible Party: Dean, Department Chair, and tenured faculty member.

3. Periodic Peer Review

Texas Education Code section 51.942 requires that tenured faculty at State of Texas institutions of higher education be subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation process conducted no more often than once a year, but no less often than once every six years, after the date the faculty member was granted tenure or received an academic promotion at the institution.

- a. The purpose of the Periodic Peer Review is to:
 - i. Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member;
 - ii. Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development;

- iii. Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals; and
 - iv. Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.
- b. At the discretion of the Dean, a periodic peer review may be required following a deficient annual evaluation. The faculty member in conjunction with the department chair, will be requested to submit materials to the chairperson of the appropriate Promotion and Tenure Committee.
 - c. The college promotion and tenure committee will meet to review all documentation and make a recommendation to the Dean including a rating on faculty member's performance. The promotion and tenure committee will provide a rating of performance in teaching, research, and service and state the basis of that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the college guidelines. A rating of "deficient" in one or more categories of performance will require the development of a Performance Improvement Plan.
 - d. For tenured faculty with budgeted appointments in more than one department, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the department where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment unless the faculty members request to be reviewed by both departments. If reviewed only by the primary department, the department chair will share the report with the department chair of the secondary department.

Responsible Party: Dean, Department Chair, and tenured faculty member

4. Professional Improvement Review

- a. At the discretion of the Dean, a professional improvement review may be required following a deficient annual evaluation.
- b. The Dean will inform the department chair of the decision within five (5) working days. The department chair will immediately inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Improvement Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review.
- c. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department chair and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist.
- d. The purposes of Professional Improvement Review are to identify and officially

acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional improvement plan (PIP) by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the PIP.

- e. The review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department chair. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department chair and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.
- f. If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Improvement Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department chair, and the dean, the decision of the Provost on the committee composition is final.
- g. The faculty member to be reviewed will be given the opportunity to submit additional materials he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within fifteen (15) working days of notification. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum the most recent annual evaluation, current curriculum vitae, and a statement of teaching and research.
- h. The department chair may add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member's academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department chair and the written response will be included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.
- i. The Professional Improvement Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within 30 working days after submission of the dossier). The Professional Improvement Review will result in one of two possible outcomes:
 - i. No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department chair, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report.
 - ii. When deficiencies are confirmed, the review committee will elaborate in writing and provide a copy to the faculty member, department chair, and dean. In the case that deficiencies are confirmed and accepted by the dean, the faculty member, review committee, and department chair shall then work together to create a PIP for submission to the dean for approval.

5. The Professional Improvement Plan (PIP)

- a. The Professional Improvement Plan shall set forth how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated collegiate criteria) will be remedied. A refusal by a faculty member to participate in good faith with the completion of the PIP will constitute good cause for dismissal and dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing revocation of tenure.
- b. Although each PIP is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will:
 - i. Identify specific deficiencies to be addressed;
 - ii. Define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
 - iii. Outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;
 - iv. Set time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes;
 - v. Identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.
- c. The faculty member and department chair will meet to set a schedule to review progress and include those dates in the PIP. The associated timeline for successful completion of a PIP will be customized to the situation, and normally range between 6 months to 12 months in length.
- d. The department chair will forward a progress report to the dean at intervals defined within the PIP.

6. Completion of the PIP

- a. The department chair shall make a final report to the faculty member and dean regarding whether the objectives of the PIP have been met, or the agreed timeline exceeded, or in any case, no later than twelve (12) months after the start of the PIP. The successful completion of the PIP is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed.
- b. The dean will determine whether the faculty member has failed to satisfactorily meet the goals of the PIP and that good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies exist. The dean will recommend to the Provost that revocation of tenure and termination be initiated. The Provost will review and provide a recommendation to the President. The President will make a final decision and provide notice to the faculty member along with a

recommendation to the Board of Regents.

Responsible Party: Provost, Dean, Department Chair, and tenured faculty member

7. Appeal

- a. If a faculty member chooses to challenge the Dean's determination regarding successful completion of the PIP, an appeal may be submitted to the Faculty Grievance and Appeal Committee. A faculty member subject to termination based on an overall finding of deficient performance on a PIP will be given the opportunity for referral of the matter to a nonbinding alternative dispute resolution as described in Chapter 154 of the Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code. If both parties agree, another type of alternative dispute resolution method may be elected.

Responsible Party: Provost, Dean, Department Chair, and tenured faculty members

References and Cross-references

Texas Education Code 51.948, Restrictions on Contracts with Administrators
Texas Education Code, 51.942, Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty
UNT Regents Rule 06.1101, Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

Approved: May 23, 2019

Effective: June 1, 2019

Revised: