

1 **DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**
2 **BY-LAW¹**

3 **Faculty Workload, Merit Evaluation, Graduate Faculty Membership,**
4 **Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review**

5 Approved by the faculty, May 4, 2018

6 Revisions as of 12-7-2018

7 Revision: 5/3/2019

8
9 The Department of Public Administration adheres to the personnel policies for faculty workload,
10 annual merit evaluation, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review found in the relevant sections of the
11 UNT Policy Manual and other policy documents of the university.

12
13 **Faculty Workload**

14
15 The department chair is responsible for ensuring that the faculty meets performance expectations, and
16 that adjustments in teaching, research, and service loads are made in accordance with the department's
17 instructional needs first and foremost. The department's top priority is adequate staffing of classes with
18 a combination of tenured and tenure-track faculty, lecturers, clinical faculty, teaching fellows, and
19 adjuncts.

20
21 Annually, each faculty member will determine, in consultation with the chair, the distribution of his/her
22 workload among the three areas of scholarly performance: teaching (T), research (R), and service (S).
23 The workload distribution will be the basis for the weights used in calculating the faculty member's
24 weighted merit evaluation score. The workload distribution will be selected from one of the four
25 options listed in Table 1 and documented on a form provided by the chair prior to the annual merit
26 evaluation process. The chair, in consultation with the Executive Committee, may adjust teaching,
27 research, and service loads at any point, after consulting with the faculty member, depending on
28 emerging needs of the department or its academic programs.

29
30 The normal teaching load of the department's tenured and tenure-track faculty is specified in Table 1.
31 Reductions in teaching load are intended as offsets for extraordinary service and research duties.
32 Faculty in their first year of employment at UNT may be granted a one course reduction from the
33 normal teaching load to facilitate adjusting to their new work environment. Summer teaching is a
34 separate contract period and not considered part of the nine-month workload assignment.

35
36 Tenured and tenure-track faculty, other than program coordinators, will normally have a 50-40-10
37 workload assignment (T-R-S) and teach four courses during the fall and spring semesters. Faculty may
38 carry a service workload of not less than 10 percent, except those holding university administrative
39 appointments (e.g., chair, associate dean, dean, or provost). Program coordinators normally receive a
40 one-course reduction for the duration of their service and will have a 40-40-20 workload assignment.
41 Faculty opting for a teaching emphasis normally carry a teaching workload of at least 60 percent and

¹ Preparation of this by-law benefitted greatly from the comments and recommendations from Dr. Neale Chumbler, Dean of the College of Health and Public Service, and from Dr. Jennifer Cowley, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Its preparation was also enriched by the policies and procedures of other UNT academic units including the Departments of History, English, Criminal Justice, and Economics.

1 teach at least seven courses during the contract period. The teaching option is available only for faculty
 2 at the rank of professor or with at least 12 years of experience in a tenure-track position. Table 1
 3 summarizes the options for workload assignment.

4
 5 Table 1. Workload options (Teaching – Research – Service)

Years of Faculty Service	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D
1-6	50-40-10	40-50-10	none	none
7-12	50-40-10	40-50-10	40-40-20	none
>12	50-40-10	40-50-10	40-40-20	60-30-10
Lecturers	80-10-10	80-0-20		

6
 7
 8 **Guidelines and Procedures for Merit Evaluations**

9
 10 The Executive Committee, serving as the department’s personnel affairs committee (PAC), annually
 11 evaluates the performance of each faculty member. In so doing the PAC will review three years of
 12 information unless the faculty member has fewer than two years of service. Three areas of evaluation
 13 are used: teaching and other pedagogical duties; scholarship and research contributions; and service to
 14 the department, University, profession, and community. The relative contribution of each area of
 15 evaluation to the final merit score will be determined in consultation with each faculty member and the
 16 department chair based on the department’s instructional needs described in the preceding section.

17
 18 Merit Evaluation Procedures

19 In January or following the calendar prescribed by the dean and provost, the PAC will review each
 20 faculty member's activities for the three preceding calendar years in the three evaluation categories –
 21 scholarship, teaching, and service. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to maintain a
 22 complete and comprehensive update of professional activities on the Faculty Information System as
 23 required by the university. While the PAC is obliged to use the information provided by each faculty
 24 member, and it may include such other information as becomes known to it, the PAC has no
 25 responsibility to research each faculty member's activities to ensure a complete record.

26
 27 In scoring performance in each evaluative area, the PAC will rate a faculty member’s efforts based on
 28 the criteria described in the following paragraphs and as governed by University policies. The PAC will
 29 adopt a procedure that neutralizes outliers such as using the median score of committee members or by
 30 excluding the highest and lowest score and averaging the remaining scores.

31
 32 The PAC will use the following rubrics for the three areas of evaluation to determine a merit score for
 33 each faculty member. The PAC may adjust this score at its discretion to reflect internal equity among
 34 faculty. Each rubric uses the same general methodology.

35
 36 Step 1: A benchmark merit category is initially determined for each area of evaluation. This sets
 37 a threshold for performance in each category. For research, the benchmark score is the merit
 38 category for the highest ranked research product during the three-year period. For teaching, the
 39 benchmark score is the median SPOT score for the three-year period. For service, the
 40 benchmark merit category is inversely linked to the faculty member’s academic rank.

1
2 Step 2. The next step adds quantity and quality of effort to the benchmark merit score. Each
3 performance product is weighted by its relative value to the department. In the case of research,
4 effort is measured and weighted by the number and quality of research products produced
5 during the three years being evaluated (articles, grants, books, book chapters, and awards). For
6 teaching, performance is measured by equally weighting the median SPOT score, observer
7 evaluations, and pedagogical activities outside the classroom (dissertations chaired, teaching
8 grants, new and revised courses, peer-reviewed articles in pedagogical journals, supervision of
9 undergraduate research experiences/competitions; experiential or service learning, travel
10 courses, and teaching awards). For service, effort is measured and weighted by the number of
11 professionally relevant service activities provided to the department, college and university,
12 community, or profession.
13

14 Step 3. The final step sums the weighted values for effort with the benchmark merit category to
15 determine a total merit score for the category being evaluated.
16
17

18 **Scholarship and Research.** In assessing a faculty member's scholarship and research contributions,
19 the PAC considers the publication of books, monographs, refereed articles, applied research reports,
20 media and software development, research grants awarded, conference proceedings, papers presented at
21 professional meetings, and other documentation that provides evidence of scholarly contributions.
22

23 The department values interdisciplinary and collaborative work, particularly work involving doctoral
24 students and tenure-track faculty in the department during their probationary period. As such, co-
25 authored works with doctoral students are treated as sole-authored works for purposes of merit,
26 promotion, and tenure. The convention in public administration is generally the ordering of authors'
27 names does not necessarily indicate their relative contribution. In multi-authored products, the faculty
28 member must indicate the percentage contribution he or she has made to the final product.
29

30 Quality of research

31 Tenure-eligible faculty are expected to contribute to the systematic development of knowledge,
32 theoretical or empirical, in one or more identifiable areas of public administration and planning.
33

34 The department places the highest value on refereed publications that appear in high impact outlets that
35 advance the scholarship of public administration and planning. In the case of publications in journals
36 that use a double-blind referee process, quality is judged based on a journal's acceptance rate or impact
37 score. It is the faculty member's responsibility to document in the Faculty Information System (FIS), or
38 other format as specified by the PAC, the quality of a journal using either of these measures. In general,
39 the PAC will consider as top-tier those journals with an acceptance rate of 25 percent or less in the year
40 that an article was unconditionally accepted for publication (as reported by the journal's editor), or with
41 an impact score of 1.75 or higher. These cut points represent approximately the top quartile of journals
42 in public administration and its related fields. At least once every three years, the chair in consultation
43 with the faculty will review a representative sample of journals to adjust these cut points. Publications
44 in peer-reviewed journals other than top-tier are valued but at a lower weight in the research rubric. The
45 PAC may adjust the weights up or down depending on evidence supporting the publication's
46 contribution to the field. Publications in journals that do not use a peer review process should be
47 considered other research products.

1
2 For research products other than peer reviewed journals, quality may be documented using such
3 sources as Google Scholar citations, reputation of the publisher, awards or reviews by sources external
4 to UNT, or other evidence of the work's impact on public policy and administration. Research products
5 other than consultant reports for which a faculty member receives a direct grant, not approved by the
6 Office of Grants and Contracts Administration (OGCA), may be considered for merit under other
7 research products. It is the faculty member's responsibility to document the scholarly impact and
8 reputational value of the work.
9

10 In the case of a book other than an anthology, the faculty member must demonstrate its scholarly
11 contribution if counted as research. The department recognizes that, in public administration, publishers
12 increasingly look to a book's market appeal when making a publication decision. As such, all books
13 have the potential for adoption as a textbook. If the book has gone through more than one edition, it
14 likely will be considered a textbook and best reported under the teaching rubric. If reported as a
15 research product, the faculty member must provide evidence of the book's scholarly impact such as the
16 peer review process, book reviews, and reputation of the publisher. The PAC retains the authority to
17 reclassify a book as either a scholarly product or as a textbook.
18

19 Digital scholarship is evaluated the same as printed works. For purposes of merit evaluation, if a
20 publication first appears in digital media and subsequently in print, the date of digital publication may
21 be used for the three-year window, or the date that it appeared in print, but not both. That is, whether
22 digital or print, a publication should be considered for one three-year period.
23

24 Research grants and contracts

25 The department values highly the pursuit of extramural funding either through grants or contracts.
26 Preference is given in the merit process for research grants awarded through a competitive, peer-
27 reviewed process in which the faculty member is either the principal or co-principal investigator. In the
28 case of a contract that has been accepted through the university's approval process, the faculty member
29 must demonstrate that a research product, such as a journal article or book chapter, was produced from
30 the project. Intramural grants awarded through a competitive process will receive modest weight in the
31 merit process only if they result in the pursuit of external funding. Grants applied for but not awarded
32 are not counted for merit purposes. Grants and contracts awarded directly to a faculty member and that
33 do not go through the university's approval process (OGCA) also receive no research credit in the
34 annual review. The exception to the previous statement are TRIP funding and grants obtained through
35 foundations that do not make awards to universities, such as the IBM Business of Government, Urban
36 Institute, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. These shall be
37 treated the same as OGCA processed funding. Scholarly products that result from such awards, such as
38 a report, collection and making publicly available data, or a working paper, may be considered as other
39 research products.
40

41 In scoring a faculty member's research and scholarship performance for the three-year evaluation
42 period, the PAC will evaluate the research record using the following rubric. Faculty may self-score
43 and submit those scores in the FIS system as additional documentation for PAC consideration.
44
45
46
47

<u>Evidence of Research Excellence</u>				
	Merit Category	Weight	Effort (count)	Total Score
Top-tier journal article (peer-reviewed)	3	0.750		
External grant (accepted by OGCA)	3	0.500		
First edition book (author or coauthor)	3	0.250		
Other than top-tier journal article (peer-reviewed)	2	0.500		
Editor of anthology, first edition	2	0.250		
Book chapter	2	0.250		
External contract (accepted by OGCA)	2	0.250		
Other research products (not peer-reviewed)	2	0.125		
External or university research award	2	0.125		
Conference presentation (up to three conferences)	1	0.125		
Internal competitive grant (external grant submitted)	1	0.125		
TOTAL			0	0
	Benchmark Merit Category	Weighted Score	Total Research Score	
Research excellence merit score	0.00	0	0.000	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Teaching. The department expects continuous improvement in each faculty member’s pedagogical duties, both in the virtual and physical classroom and outside the classroom in individual or small group instructional settings. At a minimum, faculty are expected to meet regularly with their classes, prepare a syllabus for each course including cross-listed doctoral courses, remain current in their knowledge of the subject, demonstrate steady improvement in engaging students in the classroom or online, and support student development outside the virtual or physical classroom.

10 The PAC relies on three equally weighted categories of information in evaluating teaching performance
11 for merit purposes: student evaluations of teaching performance (SPOT) or its successor; periodic
12 observations by knowledgeable persons of teaching methods, content of instructional material, and
13 instructional impact; and other pedagogical contributions to the university’s educational mission. Each
14 of the three categories contributes one-third of the weight to the overall teaching score.

15
16 Category #1: Student Perceptions of Teaching

17 In scoring a faculty member’s teaching performance for the three-year evaluation period, the PAC
18 relies on the following rubric. The student evaluation of teaching is established using the median
19 Overall Summative SPOT rating for all classes, including summer and off-campus classes, taught by
20 the faculty member during the evaluation period. For cross-listed courses, only one SPOT score for the
21 course is included in computing the median. The median score avoids the skewing effects of outliers
22 and provides a more representative measure of teaching performance over the long term. The category

1 score is then multiplied by 0.33 to determine SPOT's contribution to the overall teaching score. The
2 department chair will provide the 3-year median SPOT score to each faculty member prior to the
3 deadline for submitting data to FIS.

4
5 Category #2: Observer Evaluation of Teaching Performance

6 The second category contributing to the teaching score is observation of the faculty member in the
7 classroom by faculty outside the department who hold a rank of associate or full professor or senior or
8 principal lecturer. For untenured faculty, lecturers, and clinical faculty at entry level ranks, a peer
9 evaluation of teaching performance must be conducted within the first two years of employment in the
10 department and at least one more time before applying for promotion or tenure. The evaluation should
11 use an observation tool, preferably recommended by CLEAR or an equivalent source, and that uses or
12 can be converted to a 5-point scale. The observation instrument should evaluate teaching performance
13 in three areas: teaching methods (process), content of instructional material (content), and instructional
14 impact (outcomes). The evaluation should include a review of the syllabus, course management
15 platforms, the faculty member's statement of teaching philosophy, and sample assignments. Courses of
16 different modalities will be evaluated using the same instruments and processes.

17
18 For faculty holding ranks higher than entry level positions, an observer evaluation must be conducted
19 once every three years using the same observation tool and evaluating the same documents as used for
20 faculty in entry level positions. The department will administer a survey of PhD alumni in the past six
21 years every three years to assess the quality doctoral dissertation supervision and advising. The survey
22 should use a 5-point scale to assess chairs along relevant dimensions. .

23
24 The most recent observation category score (using a 5-point scale) is then multiplied by 0.33 to
25 determine its contribution to the overall teaching score.

26
27 Category #3: Other Pedagogical Activities

28 The third category contributing to the overall teaching score is an umbrella of activities essential to
29 recruiting and retaining students. These activities represent an essential component to effective teaching
30 and to advancing the international reputation of the department's academic programs. Tenured faculty
31 are expected to serve on and chair doctoral advisory and dissertation committees and to facilitate the
32 timely completion of the doctoral degree as prescribed in the PhD Handbook. Consideration is also
33 given by the PAC to the quantity and quality of all other student advising and mentoring. The
34 pedagogical activities are weighted in the teaching rubric according to their value to the department's
35 mission.

36
37 The cumulative value of other pedagogical activities is then multiplied by 0.33 to determine its
38 contribution to the total teaching score.

39
40 Transition Period

41 A transition period is needed for implementation of the observation category (the second category).
42 During this period, not to exceed three years, the median SPOT score will be used as the observer
43 evaluation score. Newly hired faculty and those with administrative appointments outside the
44 department may use their median SPOT score for the observer evaluation score until such time that an
45 observer evaluation is completed.

Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Teaching category	Merit Category	Category Weight	Weighted Score
1 Median SPOT rating (all classes during review period)		0.330	0.000
2 Observer evaluation (or PhD alumni survey)		0.330	0.000
3 Other pedagogical duties		Weight for pedagogical	Effort (count)
Dissertation committee chair, on time	3	0.250	
New course preparation	3	0.250	
External teaching grant (accepted by OGCA)	3	0.250	
Second or greater edition of book	3	0.250	
Major revision of course	2	0.125	
Internal or external teaching award	2	0.125	
Dissertation committee chair, not on time	2	0.125	
Other pedagogical activities (such as peer-reviewed articles in pedagogical journals, supervision of undergraduate research experiences/competitions; experiential or service learning, travel courses)	2	0.125	
Dissertation committee member	1	0.125	
			0.000
Total other pedagogical duties	0	0.000	0.330
Faculty teaching excellence score (sum of category 1, 2, 3):			0.000

1
2 **Service.** In evaluating professionally relevant service to the department, university, and community, the
3 PAC will develop a ranking based not only on the total number of activities but also on their substance,
4 importance to the department's mission, time demands, and the faculty member's contribution to the
5 final product. Service credit is awarded for program coordinators, who receive supplemental
6 compensation and/or course load reduction. No service credit is given for other monetary or in-kind
7 compensation for consulting services. Therefore, program coordinators will receive service credit for
8 semesters in which they do not receive a course reduction or monetary compensation.
9

10 In assessing service, the PAC considers activities such as service to the department, uncompensated
11 administrative/advisory positions, service to the college and university, service to the community, and
12 service to professional associations such as editorial board appointments and offices in professional
13 associations. Additionally, the PAC considers the faculty member's relationship with and service to the
14 professional constituencies vital to departmental programs. Credit toward merit is given for the number
15 of years of service provided to the activity, up to a maximum of three years for the evaluation period.
16 The willingness to bear one's share of departmental obligations is an essential part of proper collegial
17 behavior. In scoring a faculty member's service performance over a three-year period, the PAC relies
18 on the following rubric.
19

20 Faculty rank establishes the base level of service and is inversely related to the faculty member's
21 academic rank.

<u>Academic rank</u>	<u>Weight for effort</u>
Professor/Principal Lecturer	at least 3.0
Associate Professor/Senior Lecturer	at least 3.0
Assistant Professor/Lecturer	at least 4.0

26
27 The inverse relationship reflects the department's expectation that service duties will increase with
28 academic rank and tenure status. The rubric includes a weighted score for effort, measured by the
29 number of service activities, and a weighted score for years of service for those service activities
30 involving leadership roles. Additionally, the PAC may add or deduct a service impact score (in 0.10
31 increments) that accounts for the quality of service provided by the faculty member.
32

<u>Evidence of Service Excellence</u>						
	Weight for Effort	Effort (count)	Effort Weighted Score	Weight for Years of service	Years of service (1 to 3)	Total Years of Service Score
Faculty rank:						
Professor/Principal Lecturer	3.000					
Associate Professor / Senior Lecturer	3.000					
Assistant Professor / Lecturer	4.000					
Service activities:						
Journal editor/associate ed./managing ed.	0.500			0.10		

Department committee chair	0.250	0.05	
College/university committee chair	0.250	0.05	
Professional committee chair	0.250	0.05	
Community committee chair	0.250	0.05	
Program coordinator	0.250	0.05	
Department committee member	0.125		
Service grants (other than contracts)	0.125		
College/university committee member	0.125		
Editorial board member	0.125		
Professional committee member	0.125		
Community committee member	0.125		
Other department service	0.125		
Other college/university service	0.125		
Other service to discipline	0.125		
Other community service	0.125		
Faculty advising of student organization	0.100		
Consulting (pro bono, capped at 3)	0.100		
Service awards, internal or external to UNT	0.100		
Faculty development activities	0.100		
TOTAL		0.00	0.00
	Effort Weighted Score	Total Years of Service Score	Total Service
Faculty Service Score:	0	0	0.00

1
2 Final Merit Rankings and Narrative Statement
3 No member of the PAC may rate him or herself or take part in any of the discussions related to her or
4 himself. When assigning a merit rating to each area of performance, the PAC uses a five-point scale (5
5 = high, 1 = low). Following a discussion of its initial merit ratings derived from the rubrics for each
6 evaluated category, the PAC may alter the overall score to reflect new information or changes in
7 judgment. After the PAC arrives at the merit rankings, it will apply the workload weights for each of
8 the areas of professional performance determined by the procedures described in the section on Faculty
9 Workload. Within two weeks of completion of its evaluations, the chair will notify the faculty of the
10 unweighted merit score in each of the three areas of evaluation that is in the top quartile and in the
11 fiftieth percentile.
12
13 The PAC will draft and agree upon a narrative statement for each faculty member and will furnish each
14 member a report that includes this narrative, the merit score derived from the rubric for that category,
15 the PAC's rating in each category, an explanation for deviations from the rubric, the overall weighted

1 evaluation score, and a summary of the faculty member's performance. Following completion of this
2 annual review, untenured faculty in their probationary period will meet jointly with the Reappointment,
3 Promotion and Tenure Committee and department chair for a review of their professional progress and
4 advice on areas of development that require additional effort. Tenured faculty may meet with the PAC
5 if they wish.

6 7 Salary Increments

8 When the budget for salary increments becomes available to the Department, the PAC will recommend
9 to the chair appropriate increments based on the rankings established by the procedures above,
10 including the relative weights. First-year faculty members will normally receive the median salary
11 increment. Final salary recommendations are made by the chair, taking into consideration the
12 recommendations of the PAC.

13 14 Review of Rubrics

15 During the fall semester, the chair will include on the agenda of a faculty a request for input on the
16 rubrics used by the PAC to evaluate faculty performance for merit. The feedback will be used by the
17 RP&T Committee to revise the rubrics as needed or appropriate. Changes to the rubrics must be
18 approved by the faculty before being used by the PAC for undertaking merit reviews.

19 20 21 **Graduate Faculty Membership**

22 Consistent with the UNT Policy Manual on Graduate Faculty Membership, the Department of Public
23 Administration has two graduate faculty membership categories: Full and Associate. This policy
24 establishes the department criteria and review processes for attaining and maintaining graduate faculty
25 membership.

26 27 Definitions

28 **Faculty** are UNT employees with instructional or administrative responsibility. The term
29 includes non-tenure track instructors and university administrators who hold courtesy
30 appointments in the department.

31
32 **Associate Members** are Graduate Faculty members who may serve on but do not chair theses
33 or dissertation committees.

34
35 **Full Members** are Graduate Faculty members with the right to chair master's theses and
36 doctoral dissertations.

37 38 Criteria and Procedures for Graduate Faculty Membership

39 All tenure-system public administration faculty who hold a terminal degree are eligible for full
40 membership on the Graduate Faculty.

41 42 Criteria for Full Membership

43 Appointment to full graduate faculty membership is based on evidence of mature, independent work
44 during the past three calendar years in the following areas:

- 45 • Continuing research productivity as demonstrated through publications, externally funded
46 grants, and conference participation. At a minimum a faculty member must have a

1 combination of two publications or externally funded grants during the prior three calendar
2 years.

- 3 • Meritorious graduate-level teaching.
- 4 • Evidence of efficacious guidance in the quality and timely completion of dissertations.
- 5 • Participation in developing and/or grading comprehensive examinations.
- 6 • Effective advising or mentoring of graduate students.

7 8 Criteria for Associate Membership

9 Appointment to associate graduate faculty membership is based on evidence of mature, independent
10 work during the past three calendar years in the following areas:

- 11 • Meritorious graduate-level teaching
- 12 • Service on thesis or dissertation committees
- 13 • Participation in developing and/or grading comprehensive examinations
- 14 • Graduate advising or mentoring of graduate students.

15 16 Review Process

17 As part of the annual merit evaluation process, the Executive Committee (PAC) will review each
18 faculty member's record to determine if the person meets the criteria for full membership. The
19 expectation is that research-active faculty will be appointed to full membership. If the faculty member
20 does not meet the criteria to attain full membership, the faculty member may be appointed to associate
21 membership.

22
23 Appointment to full or associate membership is for one academic year and is reviewed each spring by
24 the PAC as part of its annual review for merit pay. In the event of a change in classification from full to
25 associate membership, the faculty member may continue to direct to completion any dissertation
26 committees on which he/she currently serves as chair.

27 28 29 **Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure**

30
31 Procedures for promotion and tenure represent a combination of the processes set forth in University
32 documents, instructions from the dean and provost, and in the cumulative results of annual
33 Departmental merit evaluations. Faculty members are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the
34 requirements and procedures at the department, college, and university levels.

35
36 In the Department of Public Administration, responsibility for recommending annual reappointment,
37 promotion, and tenure of probationary faculty begins with the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure
38 Committee (RP&T). The RP&T Committee is composed of all tenured faculty with an appointment in
39 the Department of Public Administration, excluding the chair and any faculty member serving on the
40 College personnel affairs committee.

41 42 Reappointment

43 The RP&T Committee annually evaluates the progress of each probationary faculty person toward
44 promotion and, as appropriate, tenure. As part of the evaluation, the committee makes a
45 recommendation on the reappointment of the faculty member. The evaluation is completed according to
46 the timetable announced by the dean of the college at the beginning of each academic year. In preparing
47 its evaluation, the RP&T committee is guided by the cumulative merit evaluations of the department's

1 PAC. The chair prepares a separate recommendation for reappointment, taking into consideration the
2 recommendation of the RP&T Committee. Both recommendations are forwarded to the dean per the
3 timetable announced at the beginning of the academic year. The third-year review is forwarded to the
4 College PAC, dean, and provost. Subsequent reviews may be forwarded if the third-year review
5 indicates further review is needed.
6

7 Annually, the chair and RP&T Committee jointly meet with probationary faculty to discuss (1) the
8 results of the merit evaluation completed by the PAC, and (2) advise the faculty person on professional
9 development areas needing additional effort. In the case of newly hired faculty, this joint meeting is
10 normally conducted at the conclusion of the first year.
11

12 Promotion and Tenure

13 A faculty member seeking promotion and, where appropriate, tenure must assist the RP&T Committee
14 in building a dossier and supplying all supporting materials requested by the Committee. One member
15 of the committee may coordinate the preparation of the dossier. The candidate and department must
16 follow the workflow calendar established by university policy.
17

18 In evaluating the cumulative record for promotion and/or tenure, the RP&T Committee relies on the
19 recommendations of external reviewers and on the PAC's cumulative annual review ratings for each
20 performance area. UNT's policy on reappointment, tenure and promotion gives the department
21 responsibility for defining specific standards of performance for the two categories used in making
22 promotion and tenure decisions: excellence and effectiveness.
23

24 In evaluating the candidate's record for promotion for all faculty or tenure, the RP&T Committee is
25 guided by the following definitions of these two levels of performance:
26

27 **Excellent:** an annual review rating of 4 or greater.

28 **Effective:** an annual review rating of at least 3.
29

30 The minimum expectation for promotion to associate professor and for tenure is as follows:
31
32

33 Minimum Performance Expectations For Promotion to Associate Professor and For 34 Tenure

Evaluation area	Performance evaluation
Research	Cumulative score of 12 points for the previous three annual reviews or for candidates requesting early review should have an average of 4.75 for fewer than three previous reviews.
Teaching	Cumulative score of 12 points for the previous three annual reviews or for candidates requesting early review should have an average of 4.75 for fewer than three previous reviews.
Service	Cumulative score of 10 points for the previous three annual reviews or for candidates requesting early review

should have an average of 4.75 for fewer than three previous reviews.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer

The non-tenured ranks of lecturer, clinical faculty, and faculty of practice provide valued services to the department and its degree programs. An entry-level, non-tenured faculty member may seek promotion to the next level by showing evidence of excellence in the instructional and service areas. A candidate seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer must meet the university requirements and have a merit record of excellent in teaching and effective in service.

Minimum Performance Expectations
for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Evaluation area	Performance evaluation
Research	Not applicable
Teaching	Excellent
Service	Effective

For promotion to Principal Lecturer, the candidate’s merit record must be excellent in both teaching and service.

Minimum Performance Expectations
for Promotion to Principal Lecturer

Evaluation area	Performance evaluation
Research	Not applicable
Teaching	Excellent
Service	Excellent

Criteria for Promotion to Assistant Professor

A faculty member seeking promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor must have a terminal degree. In addition, the faculty member must have merit ratings that demonstrate excellence in the teaching category. The candidate must also show evidence of promise with respect to scholarship and service and have merit ratings showing evidence of laudable in each of these two areas.

Minimum Performance Expectations
For Promotion to Assistant Professor

Evaluation area	Performance evaluation
Research	Effective
Teaching	Excellent
Service	Effective

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

A high standard of research proficiency must be displayed by making continuous, sustained, and significant contributions to the scholarship of public administration through publication of at least eight refereed articles in quality journals with one article in a top-tier journal and evidence of successful external funding. At least one article must be sole-authored. Co-authored articles with UNT graduate students are considered sole-authored. Per UNT’s policy on tenure and promotion, in order to be

1 recommended for promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate must have merit ratings that demonstrate
 2 excellence in both research and teaching and effective in service.

3
 4 **Minimum Performance Expectations**
 5 **For Promotion to Associate Professor**

Evaluation area	Performance evaluation
Research	Excellent
Teaching	Excellent
Service	Effective

6
 7 Criteria for Promotion to Professor

8 Per the guidelines in the UNT Policy Manual, promotion to the rank of professor requires evidence of
 9 sustained excellence in all three areas of teaching, research, and service. A favorable recommendation
 10 presumes that the faculty member’s research contributions are recognized nationally or internationally
 11 including evidence of successful external funding since the last promotion. Compelling evidence must
 12 exist in the cumulative merit evaluations and in external reviews that the faculty member has also
 13 achieved a sustained level of excellence in the areas of teaching and service, and that indications are the
 14 individual will continue to grow professionally.

15
 16 While consideration is given to the overall record of the candidate, the RP&T Committee gives
 17 particular attention to the contributions in the three areas since the candidate’s last promotion. Per
 18 UNT’s policy, to be recommended for promotion to Professor, a candidate must have merit ratings that
 19 demonstrate excellence in all three performance areas -- scholarship, teaching, and service.

20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29 **Minimum Performance Expectations**
 30 **For Promotion to Professor**

Evaluation area	Performance evaluation
Research	Cumulative score of 20 points for the previous five annual reviews or for candidates requesting early review should have an average of 5.0 for fewer than five previous reviews.
Teaching	Cumulative score of 20 points for the previous five annual reviews or for candidates requesting early review should have an average of 5.0 for fewer than five previous reviews.
Service	Cumulative score of 20 points for the previous five annual reviews or for candidates requesting early review should have an average of 4.5 for fewer than five previous reviews.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

Post-Tenure Review

All faculty are evaluated annually by the Executive Committee in each of the three area of performance for the three previous calendar years. Unsatisfactory performance occurs whenever a tenured or tenure-track faculty member receives an unweighted merit rating of less than 2.0 for teaching or research or service.

For tenured faculty at any rank, a merit score of less than 2.0 in any of the three areas will initiate the post-tenure review process described in the UNT Policy Manual. Within a month after receiving an unsatisfactory merit rating the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee and department chair will jointly prepare a Professional Development Plan for the faculty person described in the UNT Policy Manual.