

Faculty Standards Tenure, Promotion, Post-Tenure Review

1. **CMHT_Policy_Faculty_3_Standards_Tenure_Promotion_Post_Tenure_Review**
 2. **Date Issued: 10/09; 8/10 (VPAA Approved); Reviewed: 12/1/14; 2/17; VPAA & CMHT Review: 5/18, Approved and updated 11/2022**
 3. **Purpose:** To provide standards of performance expected of tenure-track faculty for tenure and promotion and tenured faculty for promotion and post-tenure review. University policy will take precedent in all cases.
UNT Policy 06.004 Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion
<https://policy.unt.edu/policy/06-004>
 4. **Assumptions**
 - 4.1 All T/TT faculty must perform at the minimum levels for teaching, scholarship and service specified by the CMHT Annual Standards for Faculty Performance. These standards are the foundation for evaluation for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review.
 - 4.2 While all T/TT faculty must meet minimum standards, all faculty are encouraged to strive for excellence across the standards of teaching, scholarship, and service as assigned in their workload.
 - 4.3 CMHT tenured/tenure-track faculty members are expected to meet or exceed three performance standards: (1) teaching, (2) scholarship, and (3) service.
 - 4.3.1 Each standard is aligned with a workload percentage unique to each faculty member. An assigned workload may vary by semester and by year depending on programmatic needs.
 - 4.3.2 Workload assignments are made by the Department Chair, approved by the Dean, and discussed with the faculty member at the annual planning meeting with the Department Chair.
 - 4.3.3 Because workloads may vary, minimal performance expectations may change across the span of an evaluation period for tenure, promotion, and/or post-tenure review.
 5. **Assumptions – Collaborative and Sole Authorship Work**
 - 5.1 CMHT supports and encourages both collaborative and sole authored work.
 - 5.2 Collaborative publications, presentations, and grants require review of contributions. While first authorship is an indication of effort; it may or may not comparatively show percentage of effort across an entire work.
 - 5.3 Faculty can demonstrate leadership by being responsible for specific work segments (e.g., data analysis, instrument development, or literature review). This needs to be clearly articulated in the dossier.
 - 5.4 Faculty may also provide information regarding an overall percentage of contribution to collaborative work. Percentages should be determined through consensus of all collaborators before submitting in FIS.
- A. Standards – Assistant Professor for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**
1. TT (probationary) faculty will be assigned 2/2, 3/2/ or 3/3 loads during their probationary period. A 2/2 load is the minimum in order to have sufficient evidence to determine excellence in teaching, the threshold criterion for determination of tenure.
 2. Promotion to rank of associate professor has the expectation of having earned a national reputation.

3. Annual expectations for scholarly productivity are based on assigned workload and identified in the CMHT “Annual Minimum Expectations for Scholarship”.
4. Probationary TT faculty who do not meet the minimum standards assigned to their workload may receive a recommendation for non-renewal of contract during their probationary period or be denied recommendation for tenure and promotion at the end of their probationary period.
5. Probationary TT faculty will be assessed annually.

The yearly reappointment review process for tenure-track faculty is as follows (per policy 06-004):

First-, Second-, and Third-Year Reappointment Review

The basis of the first-, second-, and third-year reappointment review is the annual review. The annual review of first, second, and third year tenure-track faculty members is used by the: (a) Personnel Affairs Committee (PAC) to write the annual review PAC recommendation, (b) unit review committee to write the unit review committee reappointment recommendation, and (c) unit administrator to write the annual and reappointment reviews. The unit review committee votes on first, second, and third year reappointment reviews. College review committee and dean recommendations are only required if the unit review committee and/or unit administrator confer a negative reappointment recommendation. If the dean makes a negative decision, the faculty member may request review by the provost in accordance with the grievance policy. A negative decision by the provost is final. The outcome of a first-, second-, and third- year reappointment review is either an affirmative or negative reappointment.

Midterm Reappointment Review

The midterm reappointment review begins at the end of the spring semester in the third year of the tenure-track and uses the same criteria of evaluation as the sixth-year tenure and promotion review (further elaborated on in section V.), minus the external review letter process. The eligible faculty vote will be facilitated by the unit administrator. The outcome of a midterm reappointment review is either an affirmative or negative reappointment or a mandatory fifth-year review. Midterm faculty members participate in the annual review process in addition to the midterm reappointment review process.

Fifth-Year Reappointment Review

The basis of the fifth-year reappointment review is the annual review. The annual review of fifth-year faculty members is used by the: (a) PAC to write the annual review PAC recommendation, (b) unit review committee to write the unit review committee reappointment recommendation, and (c) unit administrator to write the annual review and the reappointment review. The eligible faculty vote is facilitated by the unit administrator for fifth-year reviews. College review committee and dean recommendations are only required if the unit review committee and/or unit administrator confer a negative reappointment recommendation. If the dean confers a negative recommendation, a provost’s recommendation is required. The outcome of a fifth-year review is either an affirmative or negative reappointment.

Sixth-Year Tenure and Promotion Review

The sixth-year review process (further elaborated on in section V.), includes receipt of external review letters. The eligible faculty vote will be facilitated by the unit administrator. The outcome of a sixth-year tenure and promotion review is either an affirmative or negative tenure and promotion decision. Sixth-year faculty participate in the annual review process in addition to the sixth-year review process.

A. Standards –Tenured Associate Professor Promotion to Professor

Tenured faculty will be expected to maintain competitive scholarship in their field through annual contributions to research or pedagogy that is in alignment with their workload.

Promotion to rank of full professor has the expectation of having earned an international reputation.

Annual expectations for scholarly productivity are based on assigned workload and identified in the CMHT “Annual Minimum Expectations for Scholarship”.

Associate Professors may petition to the Department Chair and Dean to be reviewed for promotion to Professor in their fifth year in rank. Should the Department Chair and Dean determine that the dossier is not sufficient for promotion to professor, they will assist the faculty member in developing a plan of work, timeframe, and assistance to facilitate an approved plan.

Should the dossier be acceptable for evaluation for promotion to professor, then the faculty member will work with the Department Chair in developing the final dossier for evaluation by the External Reviewers, P&T (PAC) Committee, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost. The dossier will be due to the Department Chair by the date set forth in the CMHT PAC Calendar.

B. Standards – Post-Tenure Review

- a. Associate Professors and Professors will be evaluated each year in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service by the CMHT P&T (PAC) Committee and the Department Chair based on the following UNT policies:
 - a. 06.007 – Annual Review;
 - b. 06.035 – Academic Freedom and Academic Responsibility; and
 - c. P6.027 – Academic Workload.
- b. In alignment with workload, tenured faculty will be expected to maintain competitive scholarship in their field, either through annual contributions to research or pedagogy.
- c. Tenured faculty who do not meet minimum annual performance standards may be subject to post-tenure review. Post-tenure review will be initiated by a recommendation of the CMHT Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee (PAC) to the respective Department Chair and the Dean. This recommendation is based on a below average annual P&T performance evaluation for two or more of the three standards (teaching, scholarship, and service) for any annual review covering a three-year period. The standard rating scale used is: 10-9.0 = Excellent, 8.9-7.0 = Above Average, 6.9-5.0 = Average, 4.9-3.0 = Below Average, and 2.9-1.0 = Unsatisfactory.

C. New Faculty with Shortened Tenure, Hire with Tenure, or Hire with Rank

See UNT Policy 06.004 for process and requirements for a new faculty member who seeks to join CMHT with a shortened time to tenure. All variations are subject to approval by the Provost.

D. Workload and CMHT Standards for Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

- a. Assigned workload defines faculty performance expectations. A cross a span of years under review, a faculty member may have different expectations based on the performance year.
- b. To determine standards required for the review period for tenure, promotion, and/or post-tenure review, refer to the **CMHT Policy_Faculty_4_Annual_Standards_T/TT Performance**.
- c. Workload defines performance standards. Workloads may differ different among TT (probationary) faculty and T faculty. Faculty members, in discussion with their respective chairs, should determine performance standards they are expected to meet over a review period.

*Choose one outcome from among all * cells.

Annual Minimum Expectations for Scholarship.						
MINIMUM EXPECTATIONS Must be Presented, Published, or Awarded in Review Year. Grant(s) must be submitted and/ or Received in Review Year.	Workload- Assigned % Scholarship					
	60%**	50%**	40%	30%	20%	10%
Published a Peer-reviewed Article in a National or International Journal Or a Peer-reviewed Book Chapter (in print or electronic).	3	2	2	1	1	*
Published a Significant Book or Edited Book by Academic Publisher. (in print or electronic)	^	^	^	^	^	*
Made a Refereed Presentation at a National or International Conference. or Invited	3	3	2	2	1	*
External Grant Proposal Submitted proposal: counted in the year it is submitted Received and active grant: credit given for each year the grant is active	1	1	1	+	+	*

*Choose one outcome from among all * cells.

+Can substitute for refereed presentation or article.

^Can substitute for all other expected outcomes in year of publication.