

<b>Policies of the University of North Texas</b>	Chapter 6  <b>Faculty Affairs</b>
<b>15.1.2.4 Supplemental Policy on Evaluating Tenured Faculty at UNT</b>	

**Policy Statement.**

A faculty member with administrative responsibilities shall be subject to established annual review procedures for administrators, as codified by university policies. Administrative performance will not be evaluated in the faculty performance evaluation process. When administrators resume full-time faculty service, they are subject to the regular faculty review process.

**Application of Policy.**

All Faculty

**Definitions.**

None

**Procedures and Responsibilities.**

**Purpose of Evaluation.**

The evaluation of tenured faculty is a "comprehensive process that results in a fair and equitable evaluation of faculty, while rewarding quality performance." The intent of the evaluation is to "provide a written record of faculty performance to support personnel decisions regarding promotion, tenure, retention, merit salary increases, development leaves and re-employment." Further, the evaluations "provide an opportunity for each faculty member to be counseled regularly regarding his or her performance...". The process of evaluating tenured faculty "shall include both peer review and assessment by the department or division chair and/or other appropriate administrator. The process should include review by the academic dean and the provost and vice president for academic affairs..."

**Frequency of Evaluation.**

"The performance, progress and potential of each faculty member will be formally reviewed on a scheduled basis at least once every 12 months". The annual performance evaluation covers the same three-year period as other faculty evaluations.

**Areas of Evaluation.**

The annual evaluations of tenured faculty "assess, through peer review, performance and accomplishments in the areas of teaching; scholarly, creative, and professional activities; and service".

1. Teaching: The process of evaluating the **Instructional Activities** of tenured faculty include annually a close analysis of instructional assignments and other teaching responsibilities (including the number of classes and students taught), syllabi for courses taught, student evaluations for courses taught, new preparations and/or revisions, statements of teaching philosophy and goals, student advising related to the instructional process (including sponsorship of professional and pre-professional organizations), direction of theses and dissertations, honors and awards for teaching, teaching grants (applied for; received/not received), and other instructionally related activities. Each faculty member is judged in this area on his or her performance.
2. Scholarly, Creative, and Professional Activities: Each tenured faculty member is evaluated annually on his or her contributions in this area. These professional activities are carefully analyzed, and each faculty member is judged in this area on his or her performance.
3. Service: "Service to the department, college and university is expected of all members of the faculty.... It is the policy of the university to recognize exceptional service of this nature..." Each faculty member is judged in this area on his or her performance.

#### Part II: The Policy-Professional Development Program.

A tenured faculty member who receives an "unsatisfactory" evaluation from both the department personnel affairs committee (PAC) and department chair as a result of an annual performance evaluation will be required to enter a Professional Development Program. The successful completion of the Professional Development Program is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The department chair and department PAC shall consider the faculty member's entire performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly, creative and professional activities, and service over the annual performance evaluation period in finding that a faculty member has performed at an overall unsatisfactory level. The purposes of the Professional Development Program are to identify and officially to acknowledge substantial or chronic deficiencies in performance, to develop a specific Professional Development Plan by which deficiencies might be remedied, and to monitor progress toward achievement of the Professional Development Plan. Any faculty member has the right to receive a review before the department PAC and department chair and, if such a review does not resolve any differences of opinion that might exist, the right to appeal in accordance with the grievance policies of the university.

For the purpose of evaluation, each department must establish specific criteria that define satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance by department standards.

As part of this process, department chairs should counsel faculty whose ratings appear to be declining toward an unsatisfactory level, even though their ratings are still in the "satisfactory" category. Furthermore, department chairs and department PACs shall counsel faculty who have been rated "unsatisfactory" by either the department chair or the department PAC. In the latter case counseling will be documented by the department chair. (At any point in the evaluation process faculty members who dispute departmental or college/school recommendations, or final university decisions, may invoke alternative dispute resolution [ADR] mediation.)

1. Near-Term Professional Development Plan. A tenured faculty member who receives an "unsatisfactory" evaluation for the first time from both the departmental PAC and department chair shall be required to participate in a Near-Term Professional Development Plan, administered at the department level. The department chair, in consultation with the department PAC and the faculty member, shall prepare a written plan to remedy the Deficiencies. The Near-Term Professional Development Plan will be formulated in a timely fashion, normally less than six weeks after the faculty member receives an "unsatisfactory" evaluation. The Near-Term Professional Development Plan should outline goals that allow the faculty member to demonstrate reasonable progress by the next annual evaluation.

Although each Near-Term Development Plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will

- a. identify specific deficiencies to be addressed;
  - b. define specific goals or results necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
  - c. outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary results;
  - d. set time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate results;
  - e. indicate the criteria for assessment of progress in the plan; and
  - f. identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.
2. Comprehensive Professional Development Plan. A tenured faculty member who receives a subsequent "unsatisfactory" evaluation from both the department PAC and department chair in any one of four successive annual performance evaluations shall be required to participate in a Comprehensive Professional Development Plan, administered at the college or school level.

The Comprehensive Professional Development Plan will be formulated by a three-person Professional Development Committee appointed by the dean from the tenured faculty of the university. The dean is encouraged to discuss the membership of this committee with the department chair and faculty member under review. Neither the department chair nor members of the department PAC of the faculty member under

review may serve on the Professional Development Committee. The Professional Development Committee shall review the faculty member's performance. The review shall result in one of three possible findings:

- a. No deficiencies remain after Near-Term Development. The faculty member, department chair, and dean are informed in writing that no Comprehensive Professional Development Plan is required;
- b. Deficiencies remain after Near-Term Development but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing. A copy of the findings is provided to the faculty member, department chair, and the dean;
- c. Substantial or chronic deficiencies remain after a Near-Term Development. If a Professional Development Committee finds substantial or chronic deficiencies, it specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department chair, and dean. The faculty member, department chair, and Professional Development Committee shall then work together to formulate a Comprehensive Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean. The Comprehensive Professional Development Plan will be formulated in a timely fashion, normally less than six weeks after the faculty member receives an "unsatisfactory" evaluation. The Comprehensive Professional Development Plan should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the college or school. It is the obligation of all involved to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good-faith effort to implement the plan adopted.

Although each Comprehensive Professional Development Plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will

- i. identify specific deficiencies to be addressed;
- ii. define specific goals or results necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
- iii. outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary results;
- iv. set time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate results;
- v. indicate the criteria for assessment of progress in the plan; and
- vi. identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.

After the review is completed and, if necessary, the Comprehensive Professional Development Plan formulated, the Professional Development Committee will disband.

3. Assessment. The faculty member, department PAC, and department chair shall meet annually to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies as outlined in either the Near-Term Professional Development Plan or the Comprehensive Professional Development Plan. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the annual performance evaluation process may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving goals set out in either the Near-Term Professional Development Plan or the Comprehensive Professional Development Plan. Progress and the final reports shall be written by the department chair and the department PAC and forwarded to the dean.

The Near-Term Professional Development Plan and the Comprehensive Development Plan are designed to help faculty members whose composite evaluations in the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service have been determined by both their department chair and department PAC to be "unsatisfactory." Upon completion of the plans two outcomes are possible:

- a. Satisfactory Completion. If the faculty member achieves a "satisfactory" evaluation after one year on the Near-Term Professional Development Plan or up to two additional years on the Comprehensive Professional Development Plan, that faculty member's formal participation in the Professional Development Plan is over. The faculty member may, however, request a continuation of counseling and other services from the department or **the dean**.
- b. Unsatisfactory Completion. If the faculty member is unable to achieve a "satisfactory" evaluation after one year on the Near-Term Professional Development Plan and two years on the Comprehensive Professional Development Plan, the department chair and department PAC will recommend to the dean one of two outcomes for the faculty member:
  - i. One additional year in the Comprehensive Professional Development Plan. This recommendation shall be made only when the department chair and department PAC agree that the faculty member has made significant professional progress and has a reasonable likelihood of achieving a "satisfactory" evaluation by the next annual performance evaluation period. If the dean concurs that evidence exists to support the conclusion, the dean may recommend a third year in the Comprehensive Professional Development Plan. At the end of the one year extension, the chair and departmental PAC will recommend either "satisfactory completion has occurred" or "termination for cause."
  - ii. Termination for Cause. This recommendation shall be made to the dean by the department chair and department PAC, such recommendation being based upon an inference of professional incompetence or gross neglect of academic responsibility. The burden

of proof in such cases rests with the University, and both due process for dismissal and clear procedures for grievances are provided the affected faculty member.

**References and Cross-references.**

None

**Forms and Tools.**

None

Approved: 5/97

Effective:

Revised: 8/98; 6/99; 5/01; 5/11\*; 7/15\*

\*format only