

Policies of the University of North Texas	Chapter 6
15.0 Faculty Review, Tenure, and Promotion	Academic Affairs

Comment [SH1]: My comments are personal, but also reflect ongoing concerns within my Division regarding University governance and faculty rights that predate this document. This document is being developed at a time of low faculty morale and a general feeling of distrust of Upper Administration. After seeing huge investments in infrastructure during a period of little or no pay increases, some faculty are disillusioned, and wonder if the time and effort spent on this process is even necessary. For this reason, any change in policy language will be closely examined by the faculty with a view toward its impact on their daily lives, and their future at UNT.

Table of Contents

Policy Statement.	1
Application of Policy.	1
Responsible Party.....	1
General Definitions.	1
Definitions of Faculty Subject to Annual Review.	2
15.0.1 Annual Performance Reviews of All Faculty Members – Overarching Principles.....	3
15.0.2 Principles of Faculty Annual Performance Reviews to be Implemented in Unit Procedures.....	4
15.0.3 Overarching Performance Criteria for the Annual Review of All Faculty Members.....	4
1. Scholarship.....	5
2. Teaching.....	6
3. Service and Engagement.....	7
15.0.4 Probationary Periods for Tenure-system Appointments and Time in Rank.....	9
15.0.5 Extending the Probationary Period: Stopping the Tenure Clock.....	9
15.0.6 Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews.....	10
15.0.7 Denial of Reappointment and Tenure for Probationary Faculty.....	10
15.0.8 Faculty in the Professor and Librarian Ranks.....	11
15.0.8.1 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and the Granting of Tenure.....	11
15.0.8.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor.....	11
15.0.8.3 Post-Tenure Annual Review and Professional Development Program.....	12
15.0.9 Review of Faculty in the Instructor (ABD) Rank.....	14
15.0.10 Review of Faculty in the Lecturer Ranks.....	14
15.0.11 Review of Clinical and Adjunct Faculty.....	16
References and Cross-References.....	16

Policy Statement.

The University of North Texas is committed to the consistent and equitable review of faculty members in all ranks and classifications. This policy provides overarching principles for these performance reviews, which serve as the basis for evaluations related to merit-based salary increases, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure decisions. The policy provides guidelines for the development and implementation of unit-level criteria, procedures, and communication processes. The associated Administrative Procedure document provides details and guidance for the implementation of this policy. Policies and procedures regarding faculty tenure and promotion are consistent with overarching guidelines established by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).

Application of Policy.

All UNT faculty members.

Current UNT faculty members as of the approval of this policy whose contracts or letters of appointment stipulate criteria and/or timelines for review, tenure, and promotion different from this policy will be reviewed and evaluated consistent with those contracts.

Responsible Party.

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

General Definitions.

1. **Tenure.** Tenure is an appointment awarded to faculty members after successful completion of a probationary period during which criteria for tenure are met. Tenured faculty members can be dismissed by the University of North Texas Board of Regents only for adequate cause, financial exigency, or discontinuance of academic programs, and only through the established due process. Adequate cause is defined in Regents Rule 06.1206. Tenure is awarded by the University only by actions specified in this policy, its accompanying Administrative Procedure, and the UNT Policy 15.2.20, Academic Freedom and Academic Responsibility.
2. **Tenure-system Appointment.** An appointment where the faculty member is granted tenure, or where the faculty member may be granted tenure after a probationary period.
3. **Probationary Appointment.** A tenure-track appointment that includes a period of employment preceding determination of tenure status.
4. **Review.** A systematic process of examining the evidence of a faculty member's performance in the context of documented criteria and metrics. In this document, the terms review, annual

Comment [SH2]: This makes me nervous. Does financial exigency include mismanagement of University funds that may cause budget shortfalls?

review, and annual performance review are synonymous. These reviews may serve as input into a variety of evaluations. See Section 15.0.1 below.

5. **Evaluation.** The results and decisions about a faculty member's performance based on the reviews; they may take the form of merit decisions, promotion decisions, and/or tenure decisions. Some decisions may consider evidence in addition to the annual reviews.
6. **Mid-term Review.** This is the annual review near the mid-point, typically the third year, of the probationary period for an Assistant Professor or Assistant Librarian; it serves as a more extensive and intensive review than other annual reviews to assess progress towards tenure.
7. **Unit Administrator.** The head of a unit (e.g., chair, head, dean, director) who oversees reviews and evaluations.

Comment [SH3]: I am not at all as bothered by any of these terms as Post-Tenure Annual Review, found in 15.0.8.3 of this document. This carries a negative association with the old policy, invoked only in extreme cases. To invoke that every year sends a message of distrust and threats of punishment. It also depends on a fair and equitable evaluative process, which may or may not exist within each unit. It would be easy for a group of faculty on a RPTC to use this as a means for removing a faculty member they did not get along with. Maybe that is the intent of this new policy.

Definitions of Faculty Subject to Annual Review.

1. **Professor.** A faculty member with a doctorate, terminal degree, or equivalent experience who holds a tenure-system appointment. Faculty members with this classification include the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Faculty members with honorific appointments may have additional review and criteria in accordance with other University policies.
2. **Librarian.** A faculty member who holds a tenure-system appointment. Faculty members with this classification include the ranks of Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, and Librarian. All references in the following text to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor also apply to the ranks of Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, and Librarian.
3. **Instructor (ABD).** A faculty member who is expected to join the faculty with a tenure-system appointment but who has not yet successfully completed all requirements for the doctorate or terminal degree (i.e., All but dissertation).
4. **Lecturer.** A faculty member with a non-tenure system appointment. Faculty members with this classification include the ranks of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer, and Visiting Lecturer.
5. **Clinical Faculty.** A faculty member with a non-tenure system appointment whose primary professional expertise is in the practice context or whose primary professional responsibility is conducted in a clinical, professional, or practicum setting. Appointment may be either part-time or full-time.

6. **Adjunct Faculty.** A faculty member with a non-tenure system appointment and who typically serves as part-time instructional and/or research faculty. Adjunct faculty members do not serve on a full-time basis; exceptions can be made by the Provost. Appointments are usually made on a semester-by-semester basis.

15.0.1 Annual Performance Reviews of All Faculty Members – Overarching Principles.

To facilitate continued professional development, maximize faculty skills, refocus professional efforts when appropriate, assign equitable salary adjustments based on achievement and performance, provide input to tenure and promotion decisions, and assure that faculty members are meeting their obligations to the mission of the University:

- A. All faculty members will be reviewed annually (hereafter the annual review).
- B. The results of annual performance reviews provide input for evaluation of progress toward tenure and promotion, merit, and post-tenure reviews.
- C. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review that occurs in the third-year will be a more extensive and intensive review related to progress towards tenure than the reviews in years 1, 2, 4, or 5.
- D. The annual review of faculty members may include faculty peers, the unit administrator (e.g., department Chair), Dean, and Provost. UNT Policy 15.2.21 Joint Faculty Appointments provides guidelines for reviews of faculty members with joint appointments. See accompanying Administrative Procedure for specific responsibilities for each type of review.
- E. Annual reviews of all faculty members will be consistent with the overarching performance criteria outlined in this policy.
- F. Annual reviews will assess faculty productivity over a three-year calendar period (i.e. a faculty member presents a record representing the work of the previous three calendar years.)
- G. Annual reviews provide a cumulative record and, over time, build a comprehensive evidentiary base for evaluative decisions related to promotion and tenure.
- H. The University provides due process for faculty complaints and grievances; redress of such grievances will follow University guidelines and processes through the University of North Texas Review Committee (URC) and/or the University of North Texas Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPTC).

Comment [SH4]: This at first would seem to refer to the old post-tenure review, but later we see that the annual performance review and the post-tenure review are one and the same.

15.0.2 Principles of Faculty Annual Performance Reviews to be Implemented in Unit Procedures.

- A. Each unit (e.g., a department) establishes the performance criteria and procedures for annual reviews in conformance with this policy and its Administrative Procedure. The Dean and the Provost will review and approve each unit's criteria and procedures.
- B. Each unit (e.g., a department) establishes the discipline-specific criteria for the granting of tenure and promotion, and the procedures for review of progress towards tenure and promotion, including the mid-term review. The Dean and the Provost will review and approve each unit's criteria and procedures.
- C. Each unit will clearly formulate in writing its criteria and procedures for performance reviews and make these publicly accessible. The unit administrator (e.g., department Chair) will provide these criteria to faculty members at the time of appointment and subsequently as necessary to ensure all faculty members are aware of the criteria by which their performance will be reviewed. Criteria for each unit will be available online in a unit's internal system (e.g., Sharepoint, shared drive).
- D. Faculty peers, unit administrators (e.g. department Chair), the Dean, and the Provost use these criteria and procedures when participating in the review of faculty members and providing evaluation recommendations.
- E. The responsible review committee (e.g., Personnel Affairs Committee) and/or the unit administrator (e.g., department Chair) will inform each faculty member in writing of the results of her/his review per unit's documented procedures.
- F. All assigned duties, as determined by the unit administrator (e.g., department Chair), in consultation with the faculty member, and with concurrence of the Dean, will be given appropriate weight in the annual review. Faculty annual reviews must take into account the workload assignment and weighting of these assignments during the period under review.
- G. The unit administrator (e.g., department Chair) will communicate to faculty members the relationship between factors used in the performance review and recommendations for merit-based salary adjustments.
- H. The guidelines in this policy provide the foundation for clearly articulated departmental criteria that stipulate the relationships between: annual reviews and the promotion and tenure reviews; annual reviews and promotion to professor; and annual reviews and post-tenure reviews.

15.0.3 Overarching Performance Criteria for the Annual Review of All Faculty Members.

- A. Excellence and/or sustained effectiveness in the three domains of scholarship, teaching, and service will be considered in the annual performance review of all UNT faculty members. Good citizenship is a contributing factor to each of the three performance areas -

scholarship, teaching, and service (See: UNT Policy 15.2.20 Academic Freedom and Academic Responsibility; and University of North Texas Board of Regents Rules 06.1206 Adequate Cause. Criteria used in reviews will embody the values, goals, and mission of the University, as reflected in these policies and rules and in UNT's Strategic Plan (<http://www.unt.edu/president>).

Comment [SH5]: This will be a point of hot debate, as it has already been in the Academic Leadership Workshop of Nov. 6. We all know what good citizenship is, and we have seen numerous examples of it, as well as of its opposite. The problem is one of basic human nature. Some faculty are better citizens than others. This gets us into some very subjective areas. The question is: exactly how much is citizenship to be valued as a contributing factor?

- B. The weight and performance expectations of scholarship, teaching, and service will be consistent with the negotiated workload. Individual faculty may, with the approval of an appropriate administrator(s) (e.g., department Chair, Dean, Provost), adjust the weight of scholarship, teaching, and service assignments. Such versatility and flexibility must further the establishment and maintenance of excellence of the University and facilitate the professional development of the faculty and the mission of the University.
- C. In all annual reviews, excellence in any one domain will not compensate for lack of sustained effectiveness in any other area assigned as part of the negotiated workload.
- D. Contributions to domestic and global diversity and to community engagement in teaching, scholarship, and service, accompanied by good citizenship are essential to UNT's goals and will be included in the criteria for annual reviews.
- E. Definitions that follow should be applied to the expectations of the faculty member's role and assignment.
 - 1. Scholarship. Academic scholarship requires sophisticated levels of research, scholarly activities, engagement, and creative and performing arts. This scholarship contributes to discovery, knowledge, understanding, and application in diverse forms including but not limited to publications, presentations, projects, exhibits, performance, and instruction.

Comment [SH6]: This phrase implies that we might have greater flexibility in negotiating percentages. Is this the case? Can a faculty member negotiate 0% in one area, or are we preserving the current system?

Evidence to assess the quality of scholarship may include: its impact on the discipline or field; by refereed/reviewed publications or performances or other invited presentations/performances/exhibits; by externally funded scholarly work; by community-engaged research, scholarly, and creative activities; and/or by other evidence as defined by the unit (e.g., department or college).

Examples of excellence in scholarship valued by the University include but are not limited to evidence that the faculty member:

- 1. Impacts the discipline, field, or application, as measured by external objectives and metrics (e.g., comparisons within the disciplines across peer institutions and programs);
- 2. Publishes in refereed/reviewed publications within the discipline and sub disciplines;

3. Contributes invited presentations, workshops, exhibits and/or performances at national and/or international conferences and prestigious venues;
4. Publishes in refereed/reviewed publications that advance the scholarly relationship between/among disciplines;
5. Impacts communities through scholarly engagement with community partners by way of economic, civic, social, educational, health, or cultural improvement;
6. Publishes externally-reviewed documents on community-based projects completed in collaboration with community partners and/or students;
7. Demonstrates research leadership by building teams or collaborating in such teams as appropriate for disciplinary and interdisciplinary research, creative, and/or performing activities;
8. Secures funding for research, scholarly work, or scholarly engagement as appropriate to and expected in the discipline;
9. Contributes to the scholarly training and productivity of students;
10. Receives awards and/or formal recognition within the discipline (e.g., internationally, nationally, regionally, and locally within the university, college, or department).

Examples of citizenship, in the context of scholarship, may include but are not limited to: acts that further the open exchange of ideas; framing disagreements in the context of intellectual disagreements; not acting in ways that hinder the development of students, colleagues, the department, the college or the University; good stewardship of resources.

Comment [SH7]: While I agree in principle to these examples, it gets into some pretty subjective areas.

2. Teaching. The educational function of a university requires excellent teaching and the support of student success. The scope of faculty teaching is broader than conventional classroom instruction. It comprises a variety of teaching modes, formats, and media, including undergraduate and graduate instruction for matriculating students, and may include special training and educational outreach. Major activities related to teaching are participation in academic advising, counseling, and/or mentoring.

Evidence to assess the quality of teaching may include: syllabi that include learning goals and evaluation plans for assessment of the learning outcomes; teaching materials; teaching portfolios (if applicable); statement of teaching philosophy; contextual aspects of courses; other components as deemed appropriate by the field; student course evaluations; faculty reviews, including observation and assessment of teaching by faculty peers; service learning; teaching and learning within community collaborations; and/or by other evidence as defined by the unit (e.g., department or college).

Examples of excellence in teaching valued by the University include but are not limited to evidence that the faculty member:

1. Engages students with classic and current knowledge in the assigned teaching disciplines and/or subject areas by including important intellectual, scientific, and/or

- artistic developments and the histories, controversies, and epistemological discussions within their fields, and ensuring that course content is current with the existing literature;
2. Develops learning goals and assesses learning outcomes and reviews students based on clear learning standards and measurable outcomes as well as providing feedback to students throughout a course especially during the initial weeks;
 3. Applies effective pedagogical practices to provide rigor, facilitate and enhance students' learning, critical, analytical, and independent thinking; reviews and modifies teaching styles according to students' cultural and other individual differences;
 4. Creates a learning environment that values and respects intellectual diversity and stimulates intellectual inquiry, and treats all students with respect and models respect for cultural differences;
 5. Develops and/or applies technological innovations to facilitate and enhance student learning;
 6. Exposes students to service learning experiences that integrate community service with academic study to enrich learning, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities;
 7. Mentors and supervises students and provides opportunities for their research engagement, publications, presentations, exhibits and/or performances;
 8. Expands students' abilities, knowledge, and interests through engagements such as workforce readiness skills and behaviors development, study abroad opportunities, and by relating concepts to students' personal experiences and community, and/or global challenges;
 9. Creates quality collections of library, media, and Internet resources that support University curricula and research areas;
 10. Enables students, through teaching, library services, and mentoring to discover and access appropriate research materials and other information for their classes and research projects;
 11. Helps students advance their professional careers by, for example, providing letters of reference (as deemed appropriate to the qualifications of the student), networking, internship opportunities, and placement in post-graduate positions.

Examples of citizenship, in the context of teaching, may include but are not limited to: acts that encourage students to exchange ideas without intimidation; acts that further the pedagogic quality of colleagues and the intellectual development of students; acts that do not hinder colleagues' pedagogic effectiveness or the intellectual development of students; appropriate use of resources.

3. Service and Engagement. The service and engagement function and operation of the University require active participation by faculty members in a variety of external and

internal activities. Scholarly engagement, collaboration, and leadership in the community at large are integral parts of the University's mission. Similarly, faculty participation in academic and administrative units' (e.g., department, college and/or University) committee work and other assigned responsibilities is essential to the University's operations. Faculty members must assume leadership in the recruitment, retention, and mentoring of faculty and students in an effort to promote inclusiveness and domestic and international diversity. Faculty members' engagements in the community and within the University constitute essential contributions and are expected to be included in the individual faculty portfolios.

Comment [SH8]: How essential is essential, and what happens when these engagements are not part of a faculty's efforts? Is it possible that a highly valued faculty member might not have the time to be engaged in the community? Could this be seen as justification for a PDP?

Evidence to assess the quality of service and engagement may include: demonstrated leadership and engagement in professional organizations, community-based initiatives, and University enterprises; support and mentoring of colleagues; engagement in student recruitment, retention, and success; other efforts to advance the University and its community and collaborative partners; and/or by other evidence as defined by the unit (e.g., department or college).

Examples of excellence in service and engagement valued by the University include but are not limited to evidence that the faculty member:

1. Exhibits leadership, demonstrates success, and/or engages actively in professional organizations for relevant disciplines/fields;
2. Exhibits leadership, demonstrates success, and/or engages actively in community-at-large initiatives, civic groups, non-profit organizations, and public agencies;
3. Exhibits leadership in building university partnerships that deepen relationships and strengthen economic, educational, social, and cultural well-being of communities in the north Texas region and beyond;
4. Exhibits leadership, demonstrates success, and/or engages actively in departmental, college, and University operations, governance, and initiatives;
5. Uses successful and innovative methods in individual and group mentoring initiatives and effectively mentors and supports junior colleagues;
6. Promotes the internal and external recognition of professional colleagues in support of institutional and disciplinary recognition, growth, and advancement;
7. Identifies, develops, and shares initiatives that yield successful outcomes in departmental and institutional student recruitment, retention and success;
8. Initiates and promotes projects to advance the department, college, and/or University and improve their internal and external reputations.

Examples of citizenship, in the context of service and engagement, may include but are not limited to: active participation in shared governance; regular attendance at and contribution to department and college meetings; cooperation and collaboration toward department, college and University values and goals.

15.0.4 Probationary Periods for Tenure-system Appointments and Time in Rank

- A. A probationary appointment preceding determination of tenure status will be used for appointments to the Professor and Librarian ranks. The period is of different lengths depending on the appointment. The probationary period begins in the fall semester of the appointment. For a faculty member appointed for the spring semester, the probationary period begins in the fall semester of the following academic year.
- B. The maximum probationary period for a faculty member appointed as an Assistant Professor or Assistant Librarian is the equivalent of six years of full-time service, and the sixth year will normally be the mandatory tenure review year, although earlier consideration may take place if the candidate appears ready for tenure review.
- C. A faculty member appointed at the rank of Associate Professor or Associate Librarian, but without tenure, will have a probationary period of at least five years of full-time service, and the fifth year will normally be the mandatory tenure review year, although earlier consideration may take place upon request of the candidate, and agreement by the Chair and Dean.

15.0.5 Extending the Probationary Period: Stopping the Tenure Clock.

- A. In extraordinary circumstances, a tenure-track faculty member may request that the probationary period be extended, also referred to as “stopping the clock”. That time period will be excluded from the probationary period and the probationary period extended accordingly. Such circumstances may include: the birth or adoption of a child; responsibility for managing the illness or disability of a family member; serious persistent personal health issues; and/or death of a parent, spouse, child, or domestic partner; military service; and/or significant delays in fulfillment of University resources committed in the appointment letter. Not having met scholarship, teaching, service, and accompanying citizenship expectations during a previous review period does not qualify as an extenuating circumstance for extension of the probationary period.
- B. A typical exclusion is one year. In extraordinary circumstances, a second one-year exclusion and commensurate extension of the probationary period may be granted, upon approval of the Dean and Provost.
- C. Faculty members who intend to request an extension of the probationary period are encouraged to do so as early as the situation leading to the request arises. Except under extraordinary circumstances, time-period exclusion requests shall be made not later than: 1) prior to the beginning of the fifth year of the probationary period for assistant professors; 2) prior to the beginning of the fourth year for associate or full professors; and 3) during the year preceding the exclusion year for all other cases.

- D. The faculty member with the extension of the probation period will be evaluated using the same tenure performance as those faculty members who were evaluated following the standard probationary periods.

15.0.6 Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews.

- A. Every unit (e.g., department) must review annually all tenure-track faculty members during their probationary period. These annual reviews provide input on reappointment decisions and merit decisions consistent with the procedures associated with this policy. The annual reviews may be used as opportunities for mentoring tenure-track faculty members on their progress towards tenure.
- B. Formal reviews of progress towards tenure occur in the third and sixth years of the probationary period. The third-year or mid-term review is a more extensive and intensive review that includes all levels of the university, but without external review letters. In the sixth or final year of the probationary period, each tenure-track faculty member will be comprehensively reviewed for tenure, in a process that includes external review letters.
- C. Awarding of tenure will be grounded on the comprehensive review, professional judgment, and recommendations at different levels of the University, including the unit review group, e.g., PAC (which will also rely on the judgment of external reviewers), Chair, Dean, and Provost, with the concurrence of the President, and approval by the Board of Regents.

15.0.7 Denial of Reappointment and Tenure for Probationary Faculty.

- A. At any point during the probationary appointment, as stipulated in the appointment letter, the University may terminate an appointment due to outcomes of the annual review for adequate cause, financial exigency, or discontinuance of an academic program. If terminated for discontinuance of an academic program, the University will make every effort to place the probationary faculty member in another academic unit.
- B. Any faculty member not awarded tenure by the end of the initial probationary period as stipulated in the letter of appointment will be granted a terminal contract for the following academic year.
- C. Denial of tenure may not, except under very highly extraordinary circumstances and only with the approval of the Provost, result in appointment to the classification of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Principal Lecturer.
- D. Faculty may appeal reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions (see above section 15.0.1.H).

15.0.8 Faculty in the Professor and Librarian Ranks.

- A. Faculty members appointed to the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor, and the ranks of Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, or Librarian may hold tenure-system appointments. Faculty with appointments with a probationary period will have their tenure status determined per Section 15.0.6 above.

15.0.8.1 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and the Granting of Tenure.

- A. Tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor requires evidence of sustained excellence in two of the three domains of scholarship, teaching, or service, evidence of sustained effectiveness in the third domain, with good citizenship incorporated into each area. Discipline-specific standards of excellence and effectiveness are defined by the local units (e.g., department) and must be approved by the Provost. Excellence or extraordinary quality in any one domain will not compensate for lack of effectiveness in the other areas.
- B. Evaluation and recommendations will place primary emphasis, except under extraordinary circumstances, on academic work accomplished during the probationary period at the University of North Texas, although previous achievements will be considered in the course of a holistic review.
- C. In extraordinary circumstances, as reflected in disciplinary metrics and national comparisons and as deemed appropriate by the unit administrator(s) (e.g., department Chair and college Dean), the candidate for promotion and/or tenure may be reviewed early in the probationary period. If the review process is unsuccessful, the candidate may undergo the process once more during the probationary period. If the candidate is successful on either the first or second attempt, the probationary period is complete and tenure will be awarded. If the candidate is unsuccessful on the second attempt, a terminal contact will be issued.
- D. Assistant professors will be promoted to the rank of associate professor concurrent with the granting of tenure. Assistant professors may not be awarded tenure without also being awarded promotion.
- E. In the case of faculty members who entered UNT as associate professors without tenure, tenure may be awarded without promotion to full professor.

15.0.8.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor.

- A. Promotion to the rank of professor requires evidence of sustained excellence in the three domains of scholarship, teaching, and service, with good citizenship incorporated into each area, sufficient for the achievement of a national or global reputation and recognition, consistent with criteria outlined in this policy for attainment of tenure. Outcomes and

activities that address domestic and global diversity and equal opportunity may be included in the review of explicit evidence accumulated during the professional career to date.

- B. Evaluation and recommendations will place primary emphasis, except under extraordinary circumstances, on academic work accomplished during the appointment at the University of North Texas and during the tenure as associate professor.
- C. An Associate Professor may undergo the promotion process when, in consultation with the department Chair and/or Promotion and Retention Committee Chair, the faculty member believes his/her record warrants consideration for promotion. If unsuccessful, the candidate may repeat the process when, in the judgment of the department Chair and/or Promotion and Retention Committee Chair, the record has improved sufficiently to warrant reconsideration for promotion.

15.0.8.3 Post-Tenure Annual Review and Professional Development Program.

- A. The annual performance review of all tenured faculty members serves as their post-tenure review. The post-tenure review process will consider sustained excellence and effectiveness in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, with good citizenship incorporated into each area. The post-tenure review process is designed to support faculty development and sustained productivity after tenure has been awarded. The post-tenure review process will not consider whether the tenured faculty member would meet current standards for tenure at the University.
- B. Each annual performance review will result in evaluations of excellence and effectiveness according to criteria specified at the level of the evaluating unit and as stipulated in this policy and its Administrative Procedure. The University expects that all tenured faculty members earn evaluations of at least *effective* in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, with good citizenship incorporated into each area.
 - 1. A tenured faculty member whose annual performance review results in an unsatisfactory/ineffective evaluation in one or more of the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, with good citizenship incorporated into each area, shall be required to meet with the unit administrator (e.g., department Chair) to identify barriers to sustained effectiveness and outline steps to remedy the deficiencies before the next annual performance review.
 - 2. A tenured faculty member who receives a second unsatisfactory/ineffective annual performance review in the same area or another area during a rolling three-year period is required to participate in a personal Professional Development Plan (PDP). The PDP is designed to provide support and guidance to a faculty member to ensure continued professional development and sustained productivity.

Comment [SH9]: This is a red flag. Note the amount of space devoted to the negative side of the process.

Comment [SH10]: Reality check: how many current faculty are good citizens? Do you think this statement might encourage good or better citizenship?

Comment [SH11]: What is the range of evaluation terms? Is there a level between unsatisfactory/ineffective and effective? Or above effective? The term "at least" would suggest one or two higher levels. Did I miss something?

- C. When a PDP is required (see 15.0.8.3.B.2. above), the PDP is initiated with the appointment of a Faculty Professional Development Committee (FPDC, described below). The FPDC, with the faculty member, will collaboratively identify personal and/or professional barriers to sustained effectiveness in the reviewed areas. The FPDC also will assist in developing a specific PDP with clear metrics intended to facilitate professional development and remedy the deficiency(ies). The PDP will be approved by the Chair, the Dean, and the Provost, and be communicated to the faculty member in writing prior to its implementation. The FPDC will monitor progress, provide mentorship as needed, and submit periodic reports to the unit administrator (e.g., department Chair). More specific guidelines follow below and in this policy's associated Administrative Procedure.
- D. The FPDC will consist of a tenured faculty member selected by the faculty member under review, and a tenured faculty member appointed by the Dean of the college. These two members will then select a third member of the committee from a pool of faculty members provided by the Office of the Provost, who will serve as the Chair of the FPDC. The FPDC may secure additional non-voting members and other resources as deemed necessary by the committee.
- E. The FPDC will create, in consultation with the faculty member, an individualized PDP, which will:
- Identify specific deficiency(ies) to be addressed;
 - Identify the barrier(s) to sustained effectiveness in the area(s) under review;
 - Identify institutional resources available to address the identified deficiency(ies);
 - Define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiency(ies);
 - Describe the activities to be undertaken to achieve agreed-upon outcomes;
 - Articulate the criteria for assessment of progress;
 - Delineate timelines with agreed-upon milestones;
 - Identify the relevant metrics to assess progress.
- F. Upon completion of the planned activities and/or achievement of the agreed-upon outcomes, the faculty member's participation in the PDP will end and the FPDC will be dissolved. The committee will submit a final report to the unit administrator (e.g., department Chair) who will then forward it to the Dean and the Office of the Provost.
- G. Consistent with Board of Regents Rule 6.1100, Evaluation of Tenured Faculty, and as articulated in this policy, non-completion of the agreed-upon activities or failure to achieve the agreed-upon outcomes may constitute cause for terminating the faculty member's existing appointment and issuing a terminal one-year contract; the FPDC will be dissolved in this situation.
- H. If a faculty member is unable to meet the desired outcomes in the timeline described in E above, the unit administrator (e.g., department Chair and/or the college Dean) may initiate

proceedings to terminate the employment of the tenured faculty member by making said recommendation to the Provost. The Office of the Provost shall conduct an independent review of the process taking into account the faculty member's record, annual performance reviews, the reports of the FPDC, and the recommendations of the unit administrator(s).

- I. The proceedings to terminate the appointment of the tenured faculty member shall be conducted under all applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility. In all cases, the burden of proof will rest with the University as will the responsibility to provide due process and a clear set of procedures for grievances and appeals. At any point in the post-tenure review process, a faculty member who disputes unit level(s) recommendations or a final University decision has the right to appeal in accordance with the policies of the University.

15.0.9 Review of Faculty in the Instructor (ABD) Rank.

- A. An Instructor (ABD) typically has a maximum of two years to complete all requirements for the doctorate or terminal degree.
- B. Time in rank as Instructor (ABD) does not count toward the probationary period. The probationary period begins in the fall semester following completion of all requirements for the doctorate or terminal degree.
- C. An Instructor (ABD) will undergo annual performance reviews using the same criteria and expectations for an Assistant Professor.

15.0.10 Review of Faculty in the Lecturer Ranks.

- A. A faculty member may be appointed to one of three lecturer ranks and is eligible for promotion through those ranks.
- B. Faculty members in the lecturer ranks shall be reviewed annually using the same annual performance review process as other faculty members. Expectations and criteria for faculty members in the lecturer ranks will be commensurate with their primary responsibilities as listed in the negotiated workload.
- C. Faculty members in the lecturer ranks have primary responsibilities related to teaching, student success, service, community engagement, and good citizenship, and may also include other responsibilities to ensure full workload equivalence. Faculty members in the lecturer ranks are active participants in the faculty governance process, but they are not eligible to vote in decisions relating to the review process and evaluation of tenured and tenure-track faculty.

- D. For the Lecturer rank, initial appointments may be for up to three years, renewable subject to satisfactory annual performance reviews and availability of resources. For the ranks of Senior Lecturers and Principal Lecturers, appointment may be for up to five years, renewable subject to satisfactory annual performance reviews and availability of resources. Notification of intention not to reappoint for the following academic year shall be provided as stipulated in this policy's Administrative Procedure.
- E. Lecturers may apply for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer, which requires evidence of excellence in teaching and evidence of sustained effectiveness in service, accompanied by good citizenship, and consistent with the candidate's workload assignment. Candidates shall demonstrate a professional commitment to sustained productivity as appropriate to the particular appointment, as well as a commitment to the teaching mission of the University beyond specific teaching assignments. Excellence or extraordinary quality in any one domain will not compensate for lack of effectiveness in other assigned areas.
- F. To be eligible for the classification of Senior Lecturer, the candidate must have served at least five consecutive years in the rank of Lecturer or have equivalent prior teaching experience. In each of those five years the candidate must have demonstrated excellence based on University and unit criteria for teaching, student success, service, community engagement, and good citizenship. Evidence of teaching excellence for promotion to Senior Lecturer may include, but is not limited to:
- Outstanding student and peer teaching evaluations;
 - The development and/or publication of high quality instructional materials;
 - Commendations of teaching excellence from colleagues;
 - Experience conducting high quality instructional development seminars at UNT, other universities, or regional or national meetings, or the publication of articles in the area of instructional development;
 - Formal recognition by University, college/school, department, or professional group for high quality teaching; and
 - Engagement in effective advising and mentoring of students.
- G. Senior Lecturers may apply for promotion to the rank of Principal Lecturer. Successful candidates for Principal Lecturer will demonstrate that they:
- Have earned recognition in the scholarship of teaching beyond the University of North Texas;
 - Meet the criteria for excellence in teaching and be actively engaged in effective mentoring; and

- Have a record of sustained excellence in teaching and have the equivalent of ten years of ongoing college-level teaching, including at least five years at the Senior Lecturer rank, and/or the equivalent professional teaching experience.
- H. In extraordinary circumstances as reflected in disciplinary metrics and national comparisons, and as deemed appropriate to unit administrator(s) (e.g., department Chair and college Dean), candidates for promotion the rank of Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer may undergo the promotion review process earlier than the minimum number of years. In the case of Senior or Principal Lecturers who become candidates prior to the expected year of promotion, if the candidate fails to achieve promotion, the candidate may undergo the process a second time. Subsequent attempts at promotion to Senior or Principal Lecturer must be agreed to by the unit administrators (e.g., department Chair, college dean).

15.0.11 Review of Clinical and Adjunct Faculty.

- A. Clinical faculty must be reviewed at least annually by the unit administrator (e.g., department Chair) or designee, as outlined in the appointment letter, with respect to their effectiveness. Reappointment is contingent upon evaluation outcomes, needs of the unit (e.g., the department), and available resources.
- B. Adjunct faculty will be reviewed at the end of each semester of an adjunct's appointment. The unit administrator (e.g., Chair) or a designated person will conduct and document reviews of adjunct faculty's teaching effectiveness.

References and Cross-References

Administrative Procedure:

Forms and Tools:

Approved:

Effective:

Revised: