

**EXPECTATIONS FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF TENURE-TRACK AND  
TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS—FINAL DRAFT DOCUMENT**

**DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION AND ADMINISTRATION  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS**

**December 1, 2018**

Preface

This policy document is a “living” document, subject to required annual updating or even more frequent updating as the need arises. For example, it is anticipated that recalculation of some journal metrics will need to occur during the first year of implementation to ensure that the metrics are working as intended. After the first year, review and recalculation of these metrics will occur on an annual basis. The Department of Teacher Education and Administration reserves the right to “fine-tune” the document, as needed, to keep it fair and current. The TE&A RPT Committee is responsible for keeping a historical record of metrics from “example” journals and specific criteria for “high-quality” and “tier-one” journals from year to year.

Alignment of Departmental Expectations with Expectations of the College of Education

The Department of Teacher Education and Administration (TE&A) at the University of North Texas (UNT) aligns its criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion with the criteria specified in the 2018 UNT College of Education document, “Expectations for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, Addendum to UNT Policy 06.004.” The present departmental expectations apply to all current tenure-track and tenured faculty except for any faculty member whose appointment predates the current policy; in these cases, the faculty member can choose to be reviewed under the prior policy (at time of appointment) or the current policy. For new hires, the document should be specified in the appointment letter. The TE&A Department accepts and endorses the expectations outlined in the 2018 COE document for teaching activities, scholarship activities, and service and leadership activities as well as the review process specified therein for probationary faculty as well as those seeking tenure and/or promotion.

Representation on the TE&A Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Committee

The TE&A Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of all active tenured faculty members in the department except for the TE&A Department Chair and TE&A representative on the COE RPT Committee. Tenured Associate Deans who are also faculty members in TE&A may serve as long as they do not participate in RPT voting at the college level.

Additionally, one senior or principal lecturer, elected at large annually to serve as a non-tenure track faculty representative, will review dossiers and vote on non-tenure track cases only. Votes on decisions for promotion to the rank of full professor will be made only by full professors, with input from other TE&A RPT committee members. The final decision in all considerations is based on those voting.

#### Function and Duties of the TE&A Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Committee

The TE&A Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Committee shall elect a chair from its membership. The major functions of the committee are (1) to evaluate tenure-line faculty members who seek reappointment (following an initial probationary period) or who seek tenure or promotion in rank and (2) to submit recommendations to the Department Chair concerning such matters according to University policies and regulations.

The RPT Committee composes and sends a summary letter regarding each individual faculty member who is under review for reappointment or for tenure and/or promotion. The letter includes a count of positive and negative votes from committee members. The Department Chair independently considers individual faculty members' P&T files and writes a separate letter of review and recommendation. In the years prior to promotion and tenure decisions, the Department Chair and the RPT Committee Chair meet together with each faculty member under review to provide advice and counsel related to progress.

#### Statement of Our Values Related to Scholarly Productivity

The Department of Teacher Education and Administration expects a tenure-track or tenured faculty member to have a coherent body of scholarship that makes a significant contribution to knowledge related to an important issue or set of interrelated issues in the individual's field of study. Our values regarding scholarly productivity include the following:

- We value inquiry that contributes to knowledge regarding educational theory, practice, and policy. This inquiry may be approached through various theoretical lenses and employ various research approaches.
- For inquiry in any scholarly tradition, we value scholarship that evidences a logical chain of reasoning, a clear description of approach or procedures, rigorous analyses, and adequate support for claims.
- Within data-based research, we value quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods.
- We also value research that aligns with other scholarly traditions (e.g., historical, philosophical, and critical).
- We value and encourage collaborative work in the field of education as well as interdisciplinary collaborations, with authorship listed in order of contribution, not alphabetically, unless otherwise noted.
- We consider articles published in peer-reviewed national and international journals as generally the most highly regarded kind of publication for most of our subfields but

believe that, for that to be the case, the journals themselves should be highly regarded. Well-respected research journals tend quite often to be associated with major national or international professional organizations, although other forums from major publishing houses may also have that status. Overall journal quality is judged based on a combination of factors, including acceptance rates, impact factors, circulation rates, and other appropriate metrics, as well as reputation based on expert opinion.

- Scholarly books, especially authored and edited books published by major academic presses, are also highly valued. We realize that, for some traditions of inquiry, these are the most significant kinds of contributions. The reputation of the publisher is important, and the book proposal and manuscript should have undergone serious peer review. When judging an individual's intellectual contribution, we distinguish between authored books and edited books.
- Although major emphasis is on scholarly work conducted in accordance with an inquiry paradigm, which may be called "research," we also value substantive articles published in major practitioner-oriented journals that translate research and theory into practice. We also value book chapters, technical reports, policy briefs, handbook entries, curriculum materials, new media products, and other scholarly works. These publications and products may be aimed at different audiences, including not only academics but also practitioners or policymakers.
- We also see value in textbooks, which also translate theory and research into practice, but we distinguish them from scholarly books.

#### Statement of Performance Expectations and Required Evidence/Documentation in Scholarship, Teaching, and Service

In its reviews for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, the Department of Teacher Education requires evidence that a faculty member successfully meets performance expectations in scholarship, teaching, and service as specified below.

#### **Scholarship**

The Department of Teacher Education and Administration encompasses a number of fields of study related to education. Specialties in curricular areas include English education, reading education, language arts, composition studies, bilingual education, ESL education, mathematics education, social studies education, history education, early childhood education, environmental education, science education, multicultural education, global education, and educational policy. In many of these areas, there are further differentiations in scholarship according to the level of education investigated--early childhood, elementary, middle-level, and secondary.

The department also includes a large program in educational leadership. Within the area of educational leadership, researchers pursue areas of inquiry from a variety of disciplinary and theoretical lenses (e.g., ethnography, sociology, anthropology, psychology, business

management, law and policy, economics, demography, and political science). Educational leadership faculty typically publish more of their work in specialized journals than in those that serve the larger field of education, reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of the field of educational leadership.

For this department, with its diverse areas of specialization, the RPT committee evaluates scholarship according to the holistic application of the department's established criteria for scholarship as stated in this document. The department also makes use of journal metrics to establish journal quality. At least once every year, departmental faculty reach consensus on a sample list of highly-regarded journals in three areas—i.e. “data-based” journals, “other-traditions” journals (e.g., historical, philosophical, and critical), and “practitioner” journals. Specific criteria for “high-quality” and “top-tier” journals are established through the application of four primary sources of journal metrics—i.e. SCImago H Index, SJR (ranking), and SJQ (quartile); JIF5-5-Year at Year of Publication and JIF Percentile; Cabell's Acceptance Rate (or other AR metric, including the publisher's self-reported AR); and major professional association journal affiliation. Perhaps most importantly, the department further relies on expert external reviewers in a given field to judge the overall quality of a promotion and tenure candidate's publication venues and publication products. Evaluation of quality work entails and utilizes the same criteria regardless of whether works are (a) published in digital or print formats, (b) made accessible online to the public at no cost or are accessible only through individual or institutional purchase, and (c) published in English or a language other than English.

Scholarship is evaluated holistically based on evidence for meeting the following criteria for quality:

- Continuous scholarly productivity that is appropriate to one's field of research and the nature/type of research pursued. Productivity includes grantsmanship and presentations at national and international conferences as well as publications. With respect to grants, external grants that lead to publications are highly valued. For assessing the productivity of faculty members seeking reappointment or promotion with tenure to the rank of Associate Professor, primary attention goes to all years since coming to UNT. For tenured Associate Professors seeking promotion to Full Professor, emphasis is on the last three years at a minimum. With respect to quantity, the minimum expectation is an average of two high-quality publications per year during the review period and a minimum of 10 high-quality publications during the review period, with approximately 30% of these being in top-tier publication venues for Associate Professor candidates and 40% of these being in top tier publication venues for Full Professor candidates. Although translating research into practice is valued in filling out one's publication record *beyond the minimum requirements for scholarship*, publications in “data-based” journals and “other-traditions” journals tend to carry more weight than those in “practitioner” journals. In other words, “high-quality” and “top-tier” publications in “practitioner” journals do not necessarily substitute for “high-quality” and “top-tier” publications in “data-based” and “other-

traditions” journals. That said, articles in “practitioner” journals can count towards the 10-publication minimum (a) if the journal qualifies as a “top-tier” journal and (b) if the journal article directly translates a faculty member’s “data-based” research and/or “other-traditions” research into practice.

- Publication in “high-quality” journals, including premier, “top-tier” journals in one’s field. Four primary journal metrics are used to establish “high quality” and “top-tier” status: SCImago H Index, SJR (ranking), and SJQ (quartile); JIF5-5-Year at Year of Publication and JIF Percentile; Cabell’s Acceptance Rate (or other AR metric, including the publisher’s self-reported AR); and major professional association journal affiliation. (See “Appendix: Examples of Highly Regarded Journals” for specific metrics used to identify and distinguish between “high-quality” and “top-tier” journals within the three categories of “data-based,” “other-traditions,” and “practitioner” journals.) It is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide evidence of the quality of scholarship and the nature/extent of his/her contribution to a collaborative work.
- Publication of substantive scholarly articles that are aligned with an established inquiry tradition. For data-based research, the tradition may be quantitative, qualitative, and/or mixed methods.
- Publication of articles and scholarly books that contribute significant insights into educational practice or policy or contribute significant theoretical understandings.
- Publication as a sole or first author as an indicator of initiative and leadership in research.
- Scholarly collaboration, including some collaborative articles in which one is first author.
- Creation of a cohesive body of research that builds upon past research.
- A growing national reputation for individuals seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or establishment of a national reputation for individuals seeking promotion to Full Professor.
- Significance of one’s body of research reflected in number of citations, indices of impact, or other appropriate indices as well as the professional opinion of external reviewers who are experts in the field. Again, it is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide evidence.

**Note:** The criteria listed above emphasize journal articles over other publication genres and are most relevant for faculty who work in a social science tradition. It is important to acknowledge that some faculty, including those in educational history and educational philosophy, work to a greater extent in a humanities tradition. For them, scholarly books can play a greater role in determination of quality.

### **Teaching**

Teaching is evaluated holistically based on evidences of quality for the following:

- Instructional quality as assessed by scores for teaching on multiple data sources (e.g., student evaluations, peer observations/evaluations, personal teaching reflections, and

teaching portfolio artifacts). Growth in teaching quality is emphasized in moving from Assistant to Associate Professor; teaching excellence is emphasized in moving from Associate Professor to Full Professor.

- Instructional changes, based on data-based decision making, and improved student achievement/performance. This process involves (a) the synthesis of teaching data from multiple sources, (b) identification of personal strengths, areas for growth, possible actions/changes, and (c) results of implementation.
- Currency in one's field as evidenced by participation in (a) on-going professional development efforts that inform one's teaching, (b) new course development and/or periodic course revisions, (c) development/use of creative/innovative course materials and instructional methods, (d) integration of new technologies in education, and/or (e) culturally-responsive teaching practices.

Commitment to and participation in significant mentorship efforts, including (a) being mentored by one or more mentors in the promotion-tenure process and (b) providing mentorship to others (i.e., students and/or fellow faculty members of lower rank). Evidence can take various forms (e.g., completed thesis/dissertation proposals, completed theses/dissertations, collaborative conference paper presentations, collaborative journal articles, and logs of mentorship sessions/events/activities).

### **Service**

Service is evaluated holistically based on evidences of quality for the following:

- Ongoing, meaningful, and significant service contributions at multiple levels—national, university, college, department, programmatic, and/or local/community. Service expectations grow as one goes up in rank—including number of levels represented and amount of time and effort required. Junior faculty members should undertake a reasonable level of meaningful service that does not compromise their research and teaching responsibilities.
- For promotion to Full Professor, significant leadership roles, which should be at the national level in one's profession and at UNT (university, college, departmental, and/or program levels).
- Professionalism, collegiality, and a willingness to participate in the day-to-day work of a community of teacher-scholars are expected. A faculty member should be fully engaged with students and fellow faculty members and should conduct himself or herself in accordance with the department's approved Community and Collegiality document.

## APPENDIX

### EXAMPLES OF HIGHLY-REGARDED JOURNALS

The list below presents examples of prominent and well-respected journals in three categories—data-based, other-tradition, and practitioner. Within each journal category, there are journals that are representative of the major subfields within which TE&A faculty members work. The list is not intended, in any way, to be comprehensive. It simply constitutes a representative sampling of journals from relevant subfields. Our department includes faculty working within many subfields of education, and this listing reflects an attempt to include examples from each. We must emphasize that there are numerous other highly-regarded journals that might have been listed instead. The example journals listed here, like many that are not listed, are supported by relevant metrics for quality: SCImago H Index, SJR (ranking), and SJQ (quartile); JIF5-5-Year at Year of Publication and JIF Percentile; Cabell’s Acceptance Rate (or other AR metric, including the publisher’s self-reported AR); and major professional association journal affiliation. Metrics for these journals serving as examples were compiled into a separate spreadsheet (to be kept by the TE&A RPT Committee and updated annually), and ranges and medians for each of these journal metrics were used in establishing specific criteria for “high-quality” and “top-tier” journals as listed below.

It is important to note that, since TE&A faculty pursue research in a number of subfields of education, individuals are aligned with various disciplinary traditions. Standards and metrics for our research cannot be applied without respect for disciplinary considerations, and our scholarship should be judged with attention to the norms of the relevant subfield. Although we value high rankings according to quantitative metrics, it is important also to take other factors into consideration when determining the quality of a journal. These include the reputation of the editor and editorial board members and the status of the publisher. Research journals associated with major professional organizations are also valued.

It would be incorrect to judge a faculty member’s scholarship simply on the basis of journal metrics. Critically important are the substance of each article, chapter, or book and the coherence of the total body of work.

#### Examples of highly-regarded journals publishing data-based research

- American Educational Research Journal (AERA)
- Bilingual Research Journal (NABE)

- Computers and Education
- Children’s Literature in Education
- Early Childhood Research Quarterly
- Educational Administration Quarterly
- Educational Researcher
- Journal of Research in Mathematics Education
- Journal of Research on Technology Education (ISTE)
- Journal of School Administration
- Journal of Teacher Education (AACTE)
- Journal of Literacy Research
- Journal or Research in Science Teaching
- Learning, Media, and Technology
- Race, Ethnicity, and Education
- Reading Research Quarterly
- Research in the Teaching of English
- Social Studies Research and Practice
- TESOL Quarterly
- Theory and Research in Social Education

2017 metrics for “high-quality” data-based journals are listed below. A “high-quality” journal must meet at least 2 of the following criteria or have an SJQ of Q1 or have special approval based on formal appeal to the TE&A RPT Committee.

- SCImago H Index of 21 to 134 (or better)
- SJR of .15 to 2.91 (or better)
- SJQ of Q1 or Q2
- JIF 5 Year of 2.06 to 5.57 (or better)
- JIF% of 45.9% to 96.2% (or better)
- Cabell AR% of 5% to 35% (or better)
- Affiliation with a major professional association journal

2017 metrics for “top-tier” data-based journals are listed below. A “top-tier” journal must meet at least 2 of the following or have an SJQ of Q1 or have special approval based on formal appeal to the TE&A RPT Committee.

- SCImago H index of 66 (or better)
- SJR of 2.14 (or better)
- SJQ of Q1
- JIF 5 Year of 3.35 (or better)
- JIF% of 86.95% (or better)
- Cabell AR% of 10.75% (or better)



- Affiliation with a major professional association journal

**Examples of highly-regarded journals publishing major scholarly work in other traditions**

- Comparative Education Review (CIES)
- Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education
- Cultural Studies < = > Critical Methodologies
- Curriculum Inquiry
- Educational Policy
- History of Education Quarterly
- Journal of Philosophy of Education
- Mind, Culture, and Activity
- Paedagogica Historica
- Urban Education

2017 metrics for “high-quality” other-tradition journals are listed below. A “high-quality” journal must meet at least 2 of the following criteria or have an SJQ of Q1 or have special approval based on formal appeal to the TE&A RPT Committee.

- SCImago H Index of 8 to 43 (or better/higher)
- SJR of .21 to 1.19 (or better/higher)
- SJQ of Q1 or Q2
- JIF 5 Year of .65 to 2.87 (or better/higher)
- JIF% of 19.9% to 73% (or better/higher)
- Cabell AR% of 6-10 (8)% to 30% (or better/lower)
- Affiliation with a major professional association journal

2017 metrics for “top-tier” other-tradition journals are listed below. A “top-tier” journal must meet at least 2 of the following or have an SJQ of Q1 or have special approval based on formal appeal to the TE&A RPT Committee.

- SCImago H index of 40.5 (or better/higher)
- SJR of .66 (or better/higher)
- SJQ of Q1
- JIF 5 Year of 1.65 (or better/higher)
- JIF% of 49.8% (or better/higher)
- Cabell AR% of 24% (or better/lower)
- Affiliation with a major professional association journal

**Examples** of highly-regarded journals publishing significant articles for practitioners, educational policymakers and stakeholders, and the general public

- Educational Leadership
- Language Arts
- Mathematics Teacher
- Middle Education
- Multicultural Perspectives
- NABE Journal of Research and Practice
- Phi Delta Kappan
- Science Teacher
- Social Education
- Tech Trends
- TESOL Journal
- Young Children (NAEYC)

2017 metrics for “high-quality” practitioner journals are listed below. A “high-quality” journal must meet at least 2 of the following criteria or have an SJQ of Q1 or have special approval based on formal appeal to the TE&A RPT Committee):

- SCImago H Index of 5 to 94 (or better/higher)
- SJR of .13 to 3.47 (or better/higher)
- SJQ of Q1 or Q2
- JIF 5 Year of .47 to 6.16 (or better/higher)
- JIF% of 3.1% to 97.7% (or better/higher)
- Cabell AR% of 6-10 (8)% to 21-30 (25.5)% (or better/lower)
- Affiliation with a major professional association journal

2017 metrics for “top-tier” practitioner journals are listed below. A “top-tier” journal must meet at least 2 of the following or have an SJQ of Q1 or have special approval based on formal appeal to the TE&A RPT Committee.

- SCImago H index of 37 (or better/higher)
- SJR of .395 (or better/higher)
- SJQ of Q1
- JIF 5 Year of .48 (or better/higher)
- JIF% of 3.98% (or better/higher)
- Cabell AR% of 16.25% (or better/lower)
- Affiliation with a major professional association journal

**Note:** As stated previously, although translating research into practice is valued in filling out one's publication record *beyond the minimum requirements for scholarship*, publications in "data-based" journals and "other-traditions" journals tend to carry more weight than those in "practitioner" journals. "High-quality" and "top-tier" publications in "practitioner" journals do not substitute for "high-quality" and "top-tier" publications in "data-based" and "other-traditions" journals. That said, articles in "practitioner" journals can count towards the 10-publication minimum (a) if the journal qualifies as a "top-tier" journal and (b) if the journal article directly translates a faculty member's "data-based" research and/or "other-traditions" research into practice.