



Policy Chapter: Chapter 6 Faculty Affairs

Policy Number and Title: 06.052 Review of Tenured Faculty

I. Policy Statement

UNT is committed to the consistent and comprehensive review of tenured faculty members in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and administration.

II. Application of Policy

Tenured Faculty.

III. Policy Definitions

A. Administration

“Administration,” in this policy, means any assignment other than scholarship, teaching, and service 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.

B. Professional Development Plan

“Professional development plan” and “PDP,” in this policy, mean 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 faculty member. PDPs are approved by the unit administrator, dean, and provost prior to implementation.

C. Unit

“Unit,” in this policy, means an academic department/division under the administration of a UNT official with responsibilities for personnel actions related to the unit.

D. Unit Administrator

“Unit administrator,” in this policy, means the person responsible for a unit as defined in this policy.

E. Personnel Affairs Committee

“Personnel Affairs Committee” and “PAC,” in this policy, mean an elected group of faculty that make recommendations regarding unit decisions, such as annual merit, to the unit administrator and/or dean.

F. Unsatisfactory Performance

“Unsatisfactory performance,” in this policy, means the failure to sustain effectiveness in the domains of teaching, scholarship, service, and administration; 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 to consider reasonable suggestions/advice to provide correction or assistance may also be a factor when determining whether a faculty member will be placed on a PDP.

IV. Policy Responsibilities

Faculty members are reviewed annually after tenure is granted and after promotion. The review is designed to support faculty development and sustained effectiveness. The review assesses workload-based productivity within the context of a comprehensive three-year window and is not conducted for the purposes of dismissal or re-evaluation of tenure or promotion. In addition, reviews occurring after tenure and promotion must always protect academic freedom as outlined in [UNT Policy 06.035, Academic Freedom and Responsibility](#).

A. General Guidelines

1. Faculty members are expected to earn evaluations of at least sustained effectiveness in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and administration (if the faculty member is an administrator) after being awarded tenure and after promotion.
2. Each unit administrator and Personnel Affairs Committee must review all tenured faculty in the unit annually and provide a written evaluation of the areas of each faculty member's assigned workload.
3. A faculty member who receives a review of unsatisfactory in a single domain shall be placed on a PDP.
4. Numerical scores and rankings in a single domain within a unit during an annual evaluation are not necessarily indicative of unsatisfactory performance, and no single year of the three-year window will have greater weight than the other two. Failure to publish or secure external funding in a given year does not, in itself, imply unsatisfactory performance in scholarship. Negative teaching evaluations do not, in themselves, imply unsatisfactory performance in teaching.

B. Unit Criteria

1. The tenured faculty of each unit, in collaboration with the unit administrator, is responsible for developing written workload-based performance criteria for the annual review of tenured faculty and for reviewing the criteria no fewer than every six (6) years. Each unit's criteria must be consistent with those of the college and university policy.
2. The dean and provost must approve all unit criteria and ensure the criteria are sufficiently flexible to allow for differences in academic disciplines.
3. The dean will provide said criteria to each tenured faculty member.
4. The unit administrator and dean are responsible for ensuring review criteria is followed.

C. Guidelines for Professional Development

1. A faculty member who receives a rating of unsatisfactory in a single domain by the Unit Administrator shall be placed on a PDP.
2. The PDP is initiated with the appointment of a FPDC consisting of tenured faculty only. The FPDC shall be comprised of a member selected by the faculty member under review, who may be from outside UNT; a member appointed by the dean of the faculty member's college in consultation with the unit administrator; and a third individual selected by these two (2) members from a pool of UNT faculty provided by the provost. The third member will serve as the chair of the FPDC. The FPDC may select non-voting members and utilize other resources deemed necessary. The provost may appoint members to serve on the FPDC if the faculty member under review or dean fail to identify a member in a timely manner or the two (2) selected members are unable to agree on a third member in a reasonable time.
3. The FPDC, in consultation with the faculty member, will develop a written, individualized and clear plan that is intended to facilitate professional development and remedy all deficiencies noted in the annual review. The PDP will:
 - a. identify specific deficiency(ies) to be addressed;
 - b. identify factors that impeded or may have impeded the ability or opportunity to sustain effectiveness in the area or areas evaluated as unsatisfactory;
 - c. identify institutional resources available to address the identified deficiency(ies);
 - d. identify specific goals or outcomes intended to demonstrate that the noted deficiency(ies) have been corrected;
 - e. describe the activities to be undertaken to achieve agreed-upon outcomes;
 - f. articulate the criteria for assessing progress toward the agreed-upon goals or outcomes;
 - g. identify metrics to assess progress; and
 - h. establish timelines and milestones for evaluating progress.
4. The PDP must be approved by the unit administrator, dean, and provost; and communicated to the faculty member in writing prior to its implementation. The FPDC will monitor progress; provide mentorship as needed; and submit periodic reports, at least annually, to the unit administrator and the faculty member.

D. Removal from the PDP

1. A faculty member may be on a PDP for up to two (2) calendar years. At the end of each year, the FPDC will determine whether the faculty has achieved the outcomes identified in the plan.
2. If the FPDC determines the faculty member has successfully completed the PDP before

the end of the second year, it may submit a report to the unit administrator, dean, and the provost recommending the faculty member be removed from the plan. The provost will determine whether to recommend revocation of tenure and termination of employment or other appropriate disciplinary action, taking into account the faculty member's record and all annual reviews.

3. If the FPDC 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. Upon receipt of the report, the unit administrator may request additional information or clarification from the FPDC and, once satisfied with the completeness of the report, will recommend to the dean whether the faculty member's tenure should be revoked and employment terminated or other appropriate disciplinary action. Upon receipt of the report and recommendations, the provost will determine whether to recommend revocation of tenure and termination of employment, taking into account the faculty member's record and all annual reviews.
4. A faculty member who disputes the FPDC's report or any accompanying recommendation(s) may file a grievance in accordance with department or college/school guidelines and university policy. A faculty member may dispute the report and recommendation(s) on any basis, including but not limited to fairness, substantive or procedural grounds, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.
5. The university has the burden of proving that tenure should be revoked or that any other disciplinary action taken is appropriate and is responsible for publishing a grievance procedure that complies with [Section 51.942 of the Texas Education Code, Regents Rule 06.201](#), and applicable UNT policies.

V. References and Cross-References

- [Texas Education Code § 51.942, Faculty Tenure](#)
- [UNT System Board of Regents Rule 06.200, Institutional and Faculty Policy](#)
- [UNT System Board of Regents Rule 06.900, Faculty Research and Creative Activity](#)
- [UNT System Board of Regents Rule 06.1100, Evaluation of Tenured Faculty](#)
- [UNT Policy 06.002, Academic Appointments and Titles](#)
- [UNT Policy 06.007, Full-Time Faculty and Academic Administrator Annual Review, and Academic Administrator Reappointment](#)
- [UNT Policy 06.027, Academic Workload](#)
- [UNT Policy 06.035, Academic Freedom and Academic Responsibility](#)

VI. Revision History

Policy Contact:	Asst. Vice Provost, Faculty Success
Approved Date:	05/18/2018

Effective Date:	05/18/2018
Revisions:	11/06/2023