

Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policy
Department of Emergency Management and Disaster Science
University of North Texas

Approved by Department: April 29, 2019

1. Introduction

The Department of Emergency Management and Disaster Science (EMDS) is committed to maintaining excellence in teaching, research, and service. It aims to advance disaster science and practice through high quality research, an evidence-based curriculum, and meaningful engagement with the scholarly and practitioner communities. The department values academic freedom, recognizes diversity of scholarship, and encourages collaborations.

This policy delineates departmental expectations in the areas of teaching, research, and service for all candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. In addition to this policy, faculty members are expected to carefully read and understand the University of North Texas policies and procedures on reappointment, promotion, and tenure (UNT Policy 06.004 Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion) as well as the relevant policies of the College of Health and Public Service.

2. Application of Policy

This policy applies to all UNT tenured and tenure-track faculty members assigned to the Department of Emergency Management and Disaster Science.

3. The Departmental Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee

The department's Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (RPTC) will be established in accordance with UNT Policy 06.004. The committee must consist of no fewer than five (5) and no more than all eligible faculty members within the unit. Only tenured faculty members may serve on the committee when evaluating probationary faculty. Only Professors may serve on the committee when considering candidates for promotion to the full Professor rank.

If there is not a sufficient number of eligible faculty members for a committee, the department chair, with assistance from and consent of the dean, will identify tenured faculty from outside the department to serve on the department's RPTC. External members will serve one-year terms that are renewable for up to two (2) more years. One member of the RPTC will be appointed as Chair of the committee by the department chair at the beginning of each academic year.

4. Timeline and Review Process

At the beginning of each academic year, the Provost will establish a timeline for the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure process. Based on the official calendar established by the Provost's office, the department chair will communicate internal deadlines to ensure that materials are sent forward in a timely manner. Dossier materials will be submitted in Faculty Information System (FIS) in accordance with the Provost's established timeline.

All cases of reappointment, promotion, and tenure will begin with a review by the department's Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (RPTC), which will forward its recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will then conduct a separate and independent review and forward a recommendation to the RPTC of the College of Health and Public Service, which will conduct a review and forward a recommendation to the Dean. Based on the Dean's own review of the dossier and the recommendations of the departmental RPTC, department chair, and college RPTC, the Dean will forward a recommendation to the Provost.

In conjunction with the annual merit review process, described in the EMDS Annual Review Policy, all tenure-track faculty will be evaluated annually in the areas of teaching, research, and service. These reviews will be based on contributions that are documented and/or can be verified, rather than anecdotal information. The chair will provide the written evaluation to the faculty member and discuss the evaluation as part of the mentoring process. Additionally, each eligible faculty member in the department will vote whether to recommend the probationary faculty member for reappointment in the third year and each year thereafter. The chair will record and inform the faculty member of each year's vote and provide documentation of the votes in the final dossier.

5. Scope of Review

According to UNT Policy 06.004, evaluations and recommendations for tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor will place emphasis on academic work accomplished during the probationary period at UNT, although previous achievements will be considered in the course of a holistic review. For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, evaluations and recommendations will emphasize academic work accomplished during the appointment at UNT, focusing primarily on accomplishments during the time as Associate Professor. However, previous accomplishments as an Associate Professor at other institutions also may be considered in the holistic review.

6. Length of Probationary Period and Time in Rank

UNT Policy 06.004 establishes the normal lengths of the probationary periods for Assistant Professors and for those appointed at the Associate Professor level but without tenure. The policy also contains provisions for extending the length of the probationary period, also known as stopping the clock, in extraordinary circumstances. Normally, the third-year reappointment review will occur at the beginning of the candidate's third year; the review for promotion to Associate Professor will occur at the beginning of the candidate's sixth year; and a review for promotion to Professor may occur when, in consultation with the department chair and/or RPTC chair, the faculty member believes their record warrants consideration for promotion. For a faculty member appointed at the rank of Associate Professor but without tenure, a mandatory tenure-review will normally occur in the fifth year, although earlier consideration may take place upon request of the candidate and agreement with the chair and dean.

In extraordinary circumstances, as reflected in disciplinary metrics and national comparisons and as deemed appropriate by the department chair and dean, an Assistant Professor may be reviewed early in the probationary period for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate

Professor, except in the third-year review. If the early review process is unsuccessful, the candidate may be reviewed again during the sixth year.

7. The Dossier

Every candidate for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, in consultation with the department chair and the RPTC chair, will submit a dossier as part of the review process. The dossier will provide evidence of the candidate's productivity and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The official dossier must contain:

- University Information Form
- Complete, current curriculum vitae (CV)
- Self-evaluation, personal narrative (maximum 750 words)
- Departmental tenure and promotion criteria
- Cumulative results of annual evaluations and, for probationary faculty, evidence of mentoring and support throughout the reappointment, tenure, and promotion process (provided by the chair)
- Summary evaluations of teaching effectiveness, including statistical summaries of student evaluation of teaching, interpretive comment on the statistical summaries, and other evidence of student learning (provided by the chair)
- External referee letters*(provided by the chair)
- Reviewer information (provided by the chair)
- Recommendation of departmental RPTC
- Recommendation of chair
- Recommendation of college RPTC
- Recommendation of dean
- Reappointment votes for third and subsequent years (for Assistant Professors)
- Additional letters of dissent from previous evaluations of the candidate (if applicable)

*Indicates item not included in the third year reappointment review.

Additionally, UNT Policy 06.004 states that individual units or colleges may require supplemental materials stipulated at the time of appointment to be included within the dossier. For purposes of the internal departmental reviews, the candidate's dossier will include additional evidence of performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service, including but not limited to sample course syllabi, statement of teaching philosophy, peer reviews of teaching, copies of publications, awards and honors, service accomplishments, and other materials as deemed appropriate. However, the official dossier that is sent forward beyond the RPTC will only contain the items in the above list required by university policy.

8. Overarching University Criteria

Although it is the responsibility of each department to develop discipline-specific criteria for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, UNT Policy 06.004 articulates overarching university criteria that must be met. Tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires sustained excellence in the areas of teaching and research along with evidence of sustained effectiveness in the area of service. Promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of

sustained excellence in each of the three domains of teaching, research, and service sufficient for the achievement of national or international reputation and recognition.

The third-year review employs the same criteria of evaluation as the tenure review and is conducted with appropriate rigor. It is a more extensive and intensive review than the annual reviews that occur in the first and second years, and it follows the same process as a tenure and promotion review; it includes the department, the college, and the provost but without external review letters. The purpose of the third-year review is to assess whether the candidate is on a promising trajectory toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor based on tangible evidence of productivity in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

9. Departmental Criteria

According to UNT Policy 06.004 the tenured and tenure-track faculty members in each department will develop, in collaboration with the department chair, clearly written criteria and procedures for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. These procedures and criteria must be consistent with those of the college and the university and must be approved by the dean and provost. The following sections delineate the department's criteria in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

9.1 Teaching

The Department of Emergency Management and Disaster Science values high quality teaching as an essential component of its mission to educate the next generation of scholars and practitioners. All candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure must provide evidence of sustained excellence in teaching. Excellence in teaching will be evidenced by presenting a versatile teaching portfolio that includes courses taught at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; a combination of elective and required courses; consistently strong student evaluation scores (above the average for the college and university); a favorable peer-review of teaching using the department's or college's established assessment tool(s); evidence of innovative teaching strategies (e.g., incorporation of emerging technology and pedagogical strategies in the classroom) and/or experiential learning (e.g., study abroad or other field-based activities); and evidence of directed student learning (e.g., service on thesis and dissertation committees, with more weight given to chair responsibilities). It is expected that directed student learning should increase as faculty advance in time served and rank.

At a minimum, the Annual Review packet must include copies of the course syllabi, quantitative scores from the student teaching evaluations, and biennial peer reviews of teaching performance. In addition to these required documents from the Annual Review, candidates may include other supplementary materials to help the departmental RPTC conduct a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's teaching record. These materials may include, but are not limited to: statement of teaching philosophy; qualitative open-ended feedback from the university-required student teaching evaluations; samples of course assignments; teaching awards and honors; teaching-related publications and grants; chairing or serving on thesis and/or dissertation committees; supervising independent study courses and/or honor's projects; inclusion of undergraduate and/or

graduate students in research; supervising teaching assistants; and/or evidence of curriculum innovation (e.g. field-based experiences, online instruction, study abroad).

Evaluation of teaching will occur each year during the Annual Review process. Every faculty member will be assigned a performance rating as defined in the Department Annual Review Policy (effective May 2018). As described in the HPS Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Workload Policies and Procedures, levels of performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service are distinguished as follows:

Performance at Level 5 demonstrates the highest level of commitment to students, involves continuous development and revision of instructional methods and content that demonstrates innovative initiatives, and complements exceptional classroom performance with significant and ongoing activities outside the classroom. Level 4 includes evidence of highly effective teaching with innovative and continuous updating of course content and delivery. Level 3 goes beyond the minimum obligations associated with a faculty appointment, provides evidence that the faculty member has systematically upgraded the content of courses, has made a conscientious effort to consistently improve the delivery of course material, and shows evidence of attempts to make intellectual contributions in the area of instructional development. Level 2 occurs when a faculty member performs all obligations consistent with the teaching portion of their workload adequately but may not present evidence of continuous improvement or instructional development. Level 1 does not conform to the instructional role of a faculty member; performance at this level will be detrimental to a faculty member's prospects for reappointment, promotion, and tenure and could result in initiation of a professional development plan for tenured faculty (as described in section 10 of this policy and in UNT Policy 06.052 Review of Tenured Faculty).

Early career faculty members are expected to maintain a positive growth trajectory throughout the probationary period, which should transition into a sustained record of teaching excellence throughout their career. Scores from the Annual Review process will be used to assess teaching excellence. Generally, the department would expect an average of 3.0 on the annual review score in the area of teaching. In the event that any faculty member does not maintain that average, it is expected that the candidate will engage in remediation efforts to improve their teaching strategies through participation in pedagogical workshops, teaching excellence seminars, and other related opportunities. Failure of the candidate to adequately address teaching deficiencies may result in a negative recommendation for reappointment, promotion, or tenure.

9.2 Research

The Department of Emergency Management and Disaster Science is committed to the creation and dissemination of knowledge in the areas of hazards, disasters, and emergency management. The department values diversity of scholarship and encourages multi-disciplinary work. The department strongly emphasizes the importance of peer-reviewed journal articles published in

quality outlets and the pursuit of external funding for scholarly activities. Both theoretical and applied works will be considered when evaluating reappointment, promotion and tenure cases. As faculty advance in rank, the department expects continual demonstration of an active and focused research agenda and increasing national and/or international recognition in hazards, disasters, and emergency management. All candidates for reappointment, promotion and tenure must provide evidence of sustained excellence in research.

9.2.1 Quality of Scholarship

In assessing the quality of scholarship, the department conducts a comprehensive review of the candidate's body of work. Indicators of quality include but are not limited to the following: reputation of the publisher, reputation of other scholars who have published in that outlet, impact factors of the journal (e.g., journal impact factor, CiteScore, SCImago rating), citation index, acceptance rate, reputation of the association that sponsors the journal, reputation of the editorial board, and scope of readership. Generally, the department would expect quality outlets to have a journal impact factor of at least 1.0 and/or a SCImago rating in the first or second quartiles. If these measures are not available, the department will consider other quality indicators including but not necessarily limited to those previously listed. As a reference, the University of Colorado's Natural Hazards Center provides a list of interdisciplinary disaster science journals as well as quality indicators; however, this list should not be viewed as exhaustive nor should it be viewed as the sole source of quality indicators. With guidance provided by the Annual Review process and formal and informal mentorship, it is incumbent upon the candidate to report evidence of the quality of scholarship by documenting these quality factors on their annual reviews. The quality of books, book chapters, and edited volumes can be assessed based on any of the following: scope of readership, reputation of the publisher, reputation of the editorial board, and/or reputation of contributors.

9.2.1.1 Requirement to Describe Roles and Contributions to Published Work

Annual Review packets as well as dossiers submitted for faculty undergoing a third-year review, consideration for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, and consideration for promotion from Associate to full Professor are required to provide information pertaining to the quality of the scholarship in addition to specifying the roles the faculty member had on the paper or project. At a minimum, faculty will provide a qualitative description of these roles that state how the faculty member contributed to the published work. This information should be included under the Supplemental Documents option in FIS.

9.2.2 Third-Year Reappointment Review

During the third-year reappointment, candidates must show tangible evidence of good progress toward a successful tenure and promotion review. It is expected that faculty demonstrate research productivity in the areas of hazards, disasters, emergency management, as relevant to their home disciplines. Faculty must provide evidence that they are establishing a focused and independent research agenda. As part of this process, candidates are expected to sustain a minimum publication pace of 2.0 peer-reviewed articles per year in reputable academic journal outlets (see section 9.2.1 for statement on quality). To increase the likelihood of a successful review, the department encourages candidates to fully participate in the formal mentorship programs offered by the department and university.

9.2.3 Criteria for Granting Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure are required to demonstrate evidence of sustained excellence in research and scholarly activities. Promotion to the Associate Professor rank with tenure requires that candidates publish impactful scholarship in quality and recognized journals in hazards, disasters, emergency management, and/or related disciplines. It is expected that faculty sustain productivity throughout the probationary period and maintain a minimum publication pace of 2.0 peer-reviewed journal articles per year. At the time of tenure review, the candidate is expected to have a minimum of 10 articles in reputable academic journal outlets, 4-5 of which must be published in quality academic journal outlets (see section 9.2.1 for statement on quality). Faculty at the Assistant Professor rank are also required to demonstrate effort in seeking external funding for their research activities. Candidates for tenure must demonstrate they have established a focused and independent research agenda; therefore, faculty must be single author or first-author equivalent on at least 3 of the published articles. Articles or scholarship co-authored with an undergraduate or graduate student will be considered first-author equivalent. Although the primary metric for research productivity is peer-reviewed journal articles, we recognize and value diversity of scholarship. Therefore, up to 2 peer-reviewed journal articles may be substituted for other items, including: peer-reviewed book chapters, edited book volumes, authored books, and/or externally funded grants. Weights for each of these items will vary as follows:

- In light of the competitive nature of extramural funding, an external grant administered through the Office of Grants and Contracts Administration on which the candidate serves as PI or co-PI (or the equivalent) may substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal articles. Weight will be determined based on the amount of the grant, prestige of the funding agency, and competitiveness of the grant program (e.g., rigor of peer-review process, funding rates).
- Given the prestige and effort required to produce an authored book with a recognized publisher, this contribution may substitute for up to 2 peer-reviewed journal articles.

- Peer-reviewed book chapters and/or edited book volumes with a recognized publisher may be substituted for peer-reviewed journal articles on a one-to-one basis.

Equivalency should be determined through consultation with the departmental PAC and department chair as part of the Annual Review process. This consultation should be initiated as soon as possible so that expectations regarding substitutions are documented and clear to all parties involved in the tenure review process.

9.2.4 Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

With respect to scholarship, candidates seeking promotion from Associate to Full Professor will demonstrate a commitment to the growth of knowledge through diverse accomplishments. Candidates for promotion to Full Professor are expected to maintain an independent and impactful research agenda in the area of hazards, disasters, and emergency management. A balanced portfolio would be expected to include sustained research productivity through the generation of high-quality research publications, significant external funding, and achievement of a national and/or international reputation.

Faculty must demonstrate sustained research productivity through the generation of at least 12-15 peer-reviewed articles, primarily in quality journal outlets (see section 9.2.1 for statement on quality), since promotion to Associate Professor. Additionally, promotion to the rank of Full Professor requires the candidate to have secured significant external funding administered through the Office of Grants and Contracts Administration. Significant external funding is measured by the following criteria:

- Candidate's role as the PI or co-PI (or the equivalent) on the grant(s).
- Cumulative funding amount of \$250,000.
- Prestigious national and/or international funding agency.
- Full panel review through a competitive grant program.

An external grant that is awarded prior to, but that extends beyond the promotion to Associate Professor, will receive full consideration in accordance with the above criteria. A national and/or international reputation is also required and can be demonstrated through various activities including, but not limited to: continued publications in reputable and quality journal outlets; invitations to publish book chapters in important books and edited volumes; writing or editing a scholarly book; securing significant external grant funding; serving on national-level grant review panels; serving on editorial boards for recognized and quality journals in the field; and/or election or appointment to leadership roles within national and international associations. Additionally, strong letters from prominent external reviewers are required.

9.3 Service

Faculty members possess significant knowledge and expertise, holding great value when shared for the benefit of others. Service activities promote collegiality and are essential to the smooth functioning of the university. Faculty members are expected to participate in the shared governance of the department and to cultivate activities promoting positive citizenship within the university, profession, and community.

Candidates for the third-year reappointment and candidates for promotion to Associate Professor are required to provide evidence of sustained effectiveness in the area of service. Service will be evaluated each year during the departmental Annual Review process.

As stated in the departmental Annual Review Policy, performance in the area of service will be assessed as follows:

Performance at Level 5 is demonstrated by a measurable impact on the community, profession or university that is considered by the PAC to be extraordinarily high. Level 4 is characterized by a very high level of service to the university, the profession, and/or the public. Level 3 exhibits service to the university, the profession, and/or the public that exceeds the minimum of a faculty member. Level 2 represents a minimal level of service expected of a faculty member. Level 1 does not meet the minimum expectations of the service role of a faculty member; performance at this level will be detrimental to a faculty member's prospects for reappointment, promotion, and tenure and could result in initiation of a professional development plan for tenured faculty (as described in section 10 of this policy and in UNT Policy 06.052 Review of Tenured Faculty).

Scores from the Annual Review process will be used to assess excellence in service. Generally, the department would expect an average of 3.0 on the annual review score in the area of service. The quantity and depth of service activities is expected to increase as a faculty member accrues years of service and progress through the ranks. At the assistant professor rank, excellence in the area of service is measured primarily in terms of the candidate's contributions to the department. At the associate and full professor ranks, excellence in the area of service requires broader participation at the college and/or university levels, service to the profession, and service to the community. In the event that any faculty member does not maintain a 3.0 average in the area of service, it is expected that the candidate will increase their service contributions to the department, college, university, and profession. Failure of the candidate to adequately address service deficiencies may result in a negative recommendation for reappointment, promotion, or tenure.

10. Review of Tenured Faculty

As stated in UNT Policy 06.052 Review of Tenured Faculty and the EMDS Annual Review Policy, UNT and EMDS are committed to the consistent and comprehensive review of tenured faculty members in the areas of teaching, research, and service. According to that policy, a

faculty member who receives a single overall review of unsatisfactory may be placed on a professional development plan, and a faculty member who receives two overall reviews of unsatisfactory must be placed on a professional development plan. As defined in this policy, unsatisfactory is a rating below Level 2.