

Dell Medical School 2024-25 Guidelines for Promotion Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty

Table of Contents

Section A: Overview	4
A.1 Introduction.....	4
A.2 Levels of Review	4
A.3 Eligibility to Vote on a Promotion and Tenure Review Committee	4
A.4 Minimum Number of Eligible Voting Members for Promotion and Tenure Review Committees	5
A.5 Managing Joint Appointments.....	5
A.6 Years of Probationary Service	5
A.7 Effective Years in Rank	6
A.8 Minimum Amount of Qualifying Service at UT Austin.....	6
A.9 Elected Combined Service at UT Austin and Other Institution(s).....	6
A.10 Sample Timelines for On-Time Promotion Review	7
A.11 Accelerated Review	9
A.12 Invoking the Right of Consideration for Promotion Review.....	9
A.13 Considerations for Promotion	9
A.13.1. Tenure-Track Faculty	10
A.13.2. Associate Professors with Tenure	13
Section B: Areas of Excellence and Areas of Review.....	13
B.1 Educational Leadership	13
B.2 Clinical Expertise	13
B.3 Investigation and Inquiry	13
B.4 Academic and Professional Service	14
Section C: Evaluation of Areas of Review	14
Section D: Scholarship	15
Section E: Roles and Responsibilities.....	16
E.1 Department Chair and Dean Responsibilities	16

E.2	Candidate's Rights and Responsibilities	19
E.3	APT Committee Obligations	19
E.4	University Obligations	19
Section F: Dossier Assembly.....		21
F.1	Change in Rank Form.....	21
F.2	Dean's Statement	21
F.3	Department Chair's Statement	21
F.4	Joint Department Chair's Statement	22
F.5	Other Statement(s) (if applicable)	22
F.6	CV	22
F.7	Peer Observation of Teaching.....	23
F.8	Clinical Expertise	24
F.8.1	Executive Committee Statement	24
F.8.2	Candidate Statement	25
F.8.3	Summary of Clinical Activities.....	25
F.8.4	Honors and Awards	25
F.9	Educational Leadership	25
F.9.1	Executive Committee Statement	25
F.9.2	Candidate Statement	26
F.9.3	Summary of Instructional Activities	26
F.9.4	Honors and Awards	26
F.10	Investigation and Inquiry	26
F.10.1	Executive Committee Statement	26
F.10.2	Candidate Statement	27
F.10.3	List of Five Most Significant Works Completed in Rank.....	28
F.10.4	Honors and Awards	28
F.11	Academic and Professional Service	28
F.11.1	Executive Committee Statement	28
F.11.2	Candidate Statement on Academic and Professional Service	29
F.11.3.	Summary of Administrative and Professional Service Activities.....	29
F.12	Review Letters	29
F.13	Chart of Reviewers	29
F.14	Sample Solicitation Letter	29

F.15	List of Materials sent to Reviewer	30
F.16	Letters Received	30
F.17	Declinations	30
F.18	Additional Statements	30
F.19	Supplemental Materials (if applicable)	30
F.19.1	Learner Evaluations	30
F.19.2	Letters Solicited from Collaborators.....	30
F.19.3	Other Supplemental Materials	31
F.19.4	Five Most Significant Works.....	31
F.19.5	Selected Instructional Materials (Teaching Portfolio)	31
F.19.6	Selected Clinical Innovations	31
Section G:	Outcomes	31
G.1	President Conferences	31
G.2	Announcement of Decisions	31
G.3	Final Arguments in Terminal Appointment Pending Cases	31
G.4	Request for Review by the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom & Responsibility (CCAFR)	32
G.5	Grievances	32
G.6	Resources.....	32
G.7	HOP, Regents' Rules, State and Federal Law.....	33
Section H:	Appendix	33
H.1	Summary of Dossier Preparation – Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty	33
Addendum: Managing Dossier Preparation for Faculty with Joint Appointments...Error! Bookmark not defined.		

Section A: Overview

A.1 Introduction

The Dell Medical School at The University of Texas at Austin is committed to building a unique and diverse team of world-class faculty and expert healthcare leaders to re-envision the way health care is delivered and to help foster a creative learning experience for future medical leaders for long-term success.

The Dell Medical School expects all regular faculty to be active scholars with vital contributions in their respective areas of contribution which may include research, teaching, curricula, publications, care delivery and redesign, or in other areas of innovation and service.

Faculty will align with the Dell Medical School mission by demonstrating commitment to:

- Improving health in our community as a model for the nation;
- Evolving new models of person-centered, multidisciplinary care that reward value;
- Accelerating innovation and research to improve health;
- Educating leaders who transform health care; and
- Redesigning the academic health environment to better serve society.

The goal of the promotion process is to provide a thorough and objective review of the substance and merits of each faculty member's case. The review must be sufficient in its depth and character to support action in the best interests of the University, whatever the decision reached. To accomplish this, the evaluation process comprises an independent review at multiple levels: executive committee, department chair, the Dell Medical School appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) committee, dean, and president's review committee. The recommendations at each level reflect the professional judgment of each of those involved, with the president making the final decision.

The following General Guidelines describe the faculty promotion and award of tenure process, preparation of materials, and management of dossiers for tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Dell Medical School. See also the Tenure and Tenure-Track Promotion Policy on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs website.

A.2 Levels of Review

Tenured and tenure-track faculty are evaluated at five independent levels: (1) executive committee for department, (2) department chair, (3) APT committee, (4) dean, and (5) president's review committee. The president of the University of Texas at Austin makes the final decision on promotions and/or award of tenure for all tenured and tenure-track candidates.

A.3 Eligibility to Vote on a Promotion and Tenure Review Committee

Eligibility to vote on a tenured and tenure-track faculty candidate promotion and tenure review committee is limited to faculty with the following additional eligibility requirements:

- Only faculty who hold tenure and are at a higher rank than the candidate may vote on promotion and tenure review for candidates.

- Because department chairs write an independent statement with their recommendation about promotion, they are not eligible to vote as a member of the departmental executive committee. Similarly, the dean is not eligible to vote on the APT committee.
- Each faculty member participating in a candidate's promotion and tenure review may only vote once and may not vote at both the executive committee and APT committee levels.

A.4 Minimum Number of Eligible Voting Members for Promotion and Tenure Review Committees

Review committees at the department and school level (i.e., the executive committee and APT committee, respectively) must include at least five eligible voting members for each promotion and tenure case considered. In cases where there are fewer than five eligible voting faculty members on the review committee, all existing committee members will participate in the review and ad hoc reviewers, who meet the voting eligibility criteria, will be invited to participate and vote in the review. Ad hoc members may include voting eligible faculty members from outside the candidate's home department. The ad hoc reviewers should be eligible to vote and be familiar with the candidate's area of excellence and areas of review.

A.5 Managing Joint Appointments

Faculty members with joint appointments must be simultaneously reviewed in both the primary and joint department or college/school. ~~The primary and joint departments and schools and colleges must conduct independent reviews of the candidate based on evaluation of the same dossier.~~ Faculty may have joint appointments between departments within the Dell Medical School or joint appointments between the Dell Medical School and another college or school at the University. **Please see Addendum at the end of this document titled: Managing Dossier Preparation for Faculty with Joint Appointments**

For faculty with joint appointments with another school and/or college at the University, the timing of the review will follow the timeline of the other school or college, regardless of whether Dell Medical School or the other school/college is where the primary appointment resides. Therefore, faculty jointly appointed at another school or college at the University could be reviewed earlier and still be considered an on-time promotion.

The candidate's dossier will follow the guidelines for promotion document set forth by the primary department.

Areas of Excellence and areas of review along with expectations for promotion and/or award of tenure may be different in each school and/or college. Deans from each college or school must make independent recommendations regarding promotion and/or award of tenure.

A.6 Years of Probationary Service

In accordance with Regents' Rule 31007, a tenure-track faculty member accrues one year of probationary service at UT Austin when at least nine months of full-time academic service have been completed during the first academic year (September 1 – August 31) of

employment. In subsequent years of employment, a tenure-track faculty member accrues one year of probationary service at UT Austin when appointed full-time for all 12 months of the academic year.

An academic year does not count as a year of probationary service if the tenure-track faculty member: (1) receives an approved extension to the probationary period, or (2) has been on leave without pay for any portion of the academic year.

Candidates whose probationary period has been extended for personal circumstances under HOP 2-2020, for other reasons as approved by the University, or due to leave without pay in accordance with University family and medical leave policies, shall be evaluated as if the accomplishments in rank were completed during the number of years of probationary service.

A.7 Effective Years in Rank

Tenured associate professors accrue one year of service at UT Austin when at least nine months of full-time academic service have been completed during the academic year (September 1 – August 31) during their first and subsequent years of employment. An academic year does not count as an effective year in rank if the tenured associate professor has an approved personal circumstances flag.

Years of probationary service as a tenure-track associate professor count toward the total number of effective years in rank for the promotion review of a tenured associate professor.

Candidates shall be evaluated as if the accomplishments in rank were completed during the number of effective years in rank.

A.8 Minimum Amount of Qualifying Service at UT Austin

All candidates for promotion and tenure must complete a minimum of two full years of qualifying service at UT Austin before the start of the academic year in which their promotion and/or tenure case is considered by the Dell Med APT Committee.

- For tenure-track faculty members, only years of probationary service are counted toward the minimum amount of qualifying service towards mandatory review for tenure.
- For tenured faculty members, only effective years in rank are counted toward the minimum amount of qualifying service.
- For tenure-track faculty with joint appointments at Dell Med and other Colleges, Schools, and Units (CSU) at UT Austin, faculty will be reviewed for tenure on the same timeline as other CSUs, which is sooner than for Dell Med.

A.9 Elected Combined Service at UT Austin and Other Institution(s)

Candidates who were appointed as a tenured or tenure-track faculty member (or equivalent rank) at one or more other institutions immediately prior to their tenured or tenure-track appointment at UT Austin may elect to combine years of probationary service

or effective years in rank at UT Austin with up to three full years of service at the other institution(s) to satisfy the requirements for on-time promotion.

In addition, the candidate must satisfy the following in order to be reviewed for promotion or tenure:

- The minimum required years of probationary service or effective years in rank at UT Austin.
- At least three faculty peer teaching observations across at least two different academic years at UT Austin must be included in the dossier.

The candidate must inform (by email) their department chair and the Dell Med Office of Faculty Affairs that they have elected to be considered under the combined service option no later than February 1 in the year immediately preceding the review. The Dell Med Office of Faculty Affairs will then send the request to the Provost's Office.

During the course of the promotion review, the candidate's record of combined service will be evaluated using the same expectations as if the candidate had completed their service at UT Austin.

A.10 Sample Timelines for On-Time Promotion Review

Tenure-track faculty who are either not jointly appointed or are jointly appointed within departments at the Dell Medical School shall prepare their dossiers for mandatory consideration for tenure no later than the sixth year of probationary service for review in the seventh year.

Tenure-track faculty in the probationary period for tenure who hold joint appointments at other Colleges, Schools, or Units (CSUs) shall prepare their dossiers for mandatory consideration for tenure in accordance with the schedule set forth for other colleges and schools as noted below in the timelines tables.

Table 1. Mandatory Review for Tenure-Track Assistant Professors*		
	No Joint Appointment or Joint Appointment within the Dell Medical School	Joint Appointment with another College or School at the University
Year of Dossier Prep	6 th year of probationary service	5 th year of probationary service
Year of Review	7 th year of probationary service	6 th year of probationary service
Year promotion is effective	September 1 of 8 th year in rank	September 1 of 7 th year in rank
* Promotion review prior to the timelines above would be considered accelerated.		

Table 2. Mandatory Review for Tenure-Track Associate and Tenure-Track Full Professors		
	No Joint Appointment or Joint Appointment within the Dell Medical School*	Joint Appointment with another College or School at the University**
Year of Dossier Prep	6 th year of probationary service	2 nd year of probationary service
Year of Review	7 th year of probationary service	3 rd year of probationary service
Year promotion is effective	September 1 of 8 th year in rank	September 1 of 4 th year in rank
<p>* Promotion review prior to the timeline above for faculty who do not hold a joint appointment with another college or school would be considered accelerated.</p> <p>**Promotion review cannot occur prior to the timeline above for faculty with joint appointments in another college or school.</p>		

Table 3. Sample Timeline for On Time Review of Tenured Associate Professor*		
	No Joint Appointment or Joint Appointment within the Dell Medical School	Joint Appointment with another College or School at the University
Year of Dossier Prep	6 th effective year in rank	5 th effective year in rank
Year of Review	7 th effective year in rank	6 th effective year in rank
Year promotion is effective	September 1 of 8 th year in rank	September 1 of 7 th year in rank
<p>*There is no mandatory review for Tenured Associate Professor, so that timing of promotion review may occur later than the years indicated above. Promotion review prior to the timelines above would be considered accelerated.</p>		

A.11 Accelerated Review

Cases that are reviewed prior to the year designated for a mandatory or an on-time review are accelerated.

Accelerated cases must be fully explained and justified by the dean and chair and should only be put forward for review when a compelling case can be made that the candidate's record is truly exceptional across all areas of contribution, the candidate exceeds expectations for on-time promotion in all areas, and that accelerated promotion and/or tenure is in the university's best interest.

In most cases, the University will benefit from the evidence gathered from fulfillment of the entire probationary period for tenure-track faculty and minimum of seven years of effective years in rank for tenured associate professor to satisfy an on-time review prior to making a promotion and/or tenure decision because this information offers more consistent and reliable evidence to demonstrate a continuing trajectory of excellence in the professional context and environment of UT Austin.

A.12 Invoking the Right of Consideration for Promotion Review

Except when subject to restrictions imposed by disciplinary sanctions, tenured associate professors have the right to be considered for promotion as early as their tenth year of service in rank after completing at least two full academic years in service in the same rank at the University. Note that the count of effective years in rank does not include any year to which a personal circumstances flag has been applied.

- a. To invoke this right of consideration, the tenured associate professor must advise their department chair of their request to be considered for promotion no later than February 1st of the academic year immediately before the fall of the requested review year.
- b. The case shall be reviewed for promotion at all levels, including the president.
- c. Should the tenured associate professor candidate not be promoted after invoking their right of consideration for promotion review, then
 - ii. The tenured associate professor candidate may be considered for promotion during any subsequent academic year deemed appropriate by their departmental executive committee and department chair; and
 - iii. When not subject to restrictions imposed by disciplinary sanctions, the tenured associate professor candidate may again invoke their right to be considered for promotion review in the fall semester that follows completion of a minimum of five additional full academic years of service. The first year of this five-year count starts in the first academic year after the negative promotion decision is made in the spring of the prior academic year.

A.13 Considerations for Promotion

Unless otherwise specified, candidates on the tenure-track are evaluated for promotion in rank (if not already at the rank of professor) and the award of tenure and tenured candidates are evaluated for promotion in rank (designated as option A in the below scenarios).

A.13.1. Tenure-Track Faculty

a. Tenure-Track Assistant Professors

Tenure-track assistant professors who do not have a joint appointment or have a joint appointment within the Dell Medical School shall prepare their dossiers for mandatory consideration for tenure no later than the sixth year of probationary service for consideration in the seventh year. The maximum probationary period that may be served as an assistant professor on the tenure-track is seven years.

During an individual's mandatory review for tenure, as described above, the executive committee or equivalent governing committee, the department chair of their department, the Dell Medical School APT committee, and dean, shall recommend to the administration that they:

- A.** Be promoted to associate professor with tenure; or
- B.** Be promoted to associate professor and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or
- C.** Remain at the assistant professor rank and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or
- D.** Be placed on a terminal appointment for the next year.

Note: Tenure-track assistant professors in the probationary period for tenure who hold joint appointments at another college, school, or unit (CSUs) shall prepare their dossiers for mandatory consideration for tenure no later than the fifth year of probationary service for review in the sixth year; the maximum probationary period that they may serve on the tenure-track is six years. Review prior to the mandatory review for tenure is considered an accelerated review. The possible outcomes for these faculty members can be found in the *UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty*.

Review during the third through the sixth year of probationary service is considered an accelerated review for Dell Med faculty who do not hold a joint appointment or hold a joint appointment within the Dell Medical School. In the rare circumstance where an individual is reviewed on an accelerated schedule, the executive committee or equivalent governing committee, and department chair of their department, the Dell Medical School APT committee, and dean, shall recommend to the administration that they:

- A.** Be promoted to associate professor with tenure; or
- B.** Be promoted to associate professor and remain on the tenure-track; or
- C.** Be promoted to associate professor and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or
- D.** Remain at the assistant professor rank and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or
- E.** Be placed on a terminal appointment for the next year; or
- F.** Will not be promoted at this time and will remain a tenure-track assistant professor until they prepare their dossier for mandatory review for tenure in their 6th year to be considered for award of tenure in their 7th year for Dell Med faculty without a joint appointment at another CSU or 5th and 6th years, respectively, for Dell Med faculty with a joint appointment at another CSU.

b. Tenure-track Associate Professors

Tenure-track associate professors who do not have a joint appointment or have a joint appointment within the Dell Medical School shall prepare their dossiers for mandatory consideration for tenure no later than the sixth year of probationary service for consideration in the seventh year. If the individual has previously held the rank of assistant professor on the tenure-track at UT Austin or elected to combine service on the tenure-track from another institution(s), the maximum period that may be served in any combination in rank of assistant professor tenure-track and associate professor tenure-track shall not exceed seven years.

During an individual's mandatory review for tenure (i.e., seventh year of full-time service as an associate professor tenure-track or of combined service as an assistant professor tenure-track and associate professor tenure-track), the executive committee or equivalent governing committee, and department chair of their department, the Dell Medical School APT committee, and dean, shall recommend to the administration that they:

- A.** Award tenure in the rank of associate professor; or
- B.** Be promoted to professor with tenure; or
- C.** Be promoted to professor and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or
- D.** Remain at the associate professor rank and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or
- E.** Be placed on a terminal appointment for the next year, which would be the seventh year.

Note: Tenure-track associate professors in the probationary period for tenure who hold joint appointments at another college, school, or unit (CSUs) shall prepare their dossiers for mandatory consideration for tenure no later than the second year of probationary service for review in the third year; the maximum probationary period that they may serve on the tenure-track is three years. The possible outcomes for these faculty members can be found in the *UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty*.

Review during the third through the sixth year of probationary service is considered an accelerated review for Dell Med faculty who do not hold a joint appointment or hold a joint appointment within the Dell Medical School. In the rare circumstance where an individual is reviewed prior to completion of the required probationary period as an associate professor tenure-track, or of combined service as an assistant professor on the tenure-track and associate professor tenure-track, the executive committee or equivalent governing committee, and department chair of their department, the Dell Medical School APT committee, and dean, shall recommend to the administration that they:

- A.** Award tenure in the rank of associate professor; or
- B.** Be promoted to professor with tenure; or
- C.** Be promoted to professor and remain on the tenure-track; or,
- D.** Be promoted to professor and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or
- E.** Remain at the associate professor rank and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or
- F.** Be placed on terminal appointment for the next year; or

- G.** Will not be promoted at this time and will remain a tenure-track associate professor until they prepare their dossier for mandatory review in their 6th year to be considered for award of tenure in their 7th year.

c. Tenure-track Professors

From time to time, there may be an occasional individual whose initial appointment is as professor on the tenure-track. The maximum probationary period that may be served as a professor on the tenure-track for faculty who do not hold a joint appointment or hold a joint appointment within the Dell Medical School is seven years. If the individual has previously held the rank of assistant and/or associate professor on the tenure-track at UT Austin or elected to combine service on the tenure-track from another institution(s), the maximum period that may be served in any combination on the tenure-track shall not exceed seven years.

During an individual's mandatory review for tenure the executive committee or equivalent governing committee, and department chair of their department, the Dell Medical School APT committee, and dean, shall recommend to the administration that they:

- A.** Be awarded tenure in the rank of professor; or
- B.** Remain at the professor rank and be moved to a professional- track appointment; or
- C.** Be placed on a terminal appointment for the next (i.e., eighth) year.

Note: Tenure-track professors in the probationary period for tenure who hold joint appointments at another college, school, or unit (CSUs) shall prepare their dossiers for mandatory consideration for tenure no later than the second year of probationary service for review in the third year; the maximum probationary period that they may serve on the tenure-track is three years. The possible outcomes for these faculty members can be found in the *UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty*.

Review during the third through the sixth year of probationary service is considered an accelerated review for Dell Med faculty who do not hold a joint appointment or hold a joint appointment within the Dell Medical School. In the rare circumstance where an individual is reviewed prior to completion of the required probationary period as a professor tenure-track, the executive committee or equivalent governing committee, and department chair of their department, the Dell Medical School APT committee, and dean, shall recommend to the administration that they:

- A.** Be awarded tenure in the rank of professor; or
- B.** Remain at the professor rank and be moved to a professional-track appointment;
- C.** Be placed on terminal appointment for the next (i.e., eighth) year; or
- D.** Will not be promoted at this time and will remain a tenure-track professor until they prepare their dossier for mandatory review in their 6th year to be considered for award of tenure in their 7th year.

A.13.2. Associate Professors with Tenure

Associate professors with tenure may be considered for promotion to professor during any year deemed appropriate by the executive committee or equivalent governing committee, department chair of their department, the Dell Medical School APT committee, and dean. Accelerated cases reviewed prior to the seventh effective year in rank must be fully explained and justified by the dean and chair and should only be put forward for review when a compelling case can be made that the candidate's record is truly exceptional across all areas of contribution, the candidate exceeds expectations for on-time promotion in all areas, and that accelerated promotion and tenure is in the university's best interest.

The executive committee or equivalent governing committee, and department chair of their department, the Dell Medical School APT committee, and dean, shall recommend to the administration that they:

- A.** Be promoted to professor with tenure; or
- B.** Not be promoted to professor with tenure.

Section B: Areas of Excellence and Areas of Review

The Dell Medical School defines four Areas of Review that align with its mission, with promotion in these Areas based on pre-established guidelines for achievement set by the medical school. Tenured and tenure-track faculty require evaluation in their designated Area of Excellence and a strong record of accomplishments in all remaining areas of review.

Academic and Professional Service is an Area of Review, but may not be designated as an Area of Excellence. Clinical Expertise is reviewed only for faculty who provide clinical services.

B.1 Educational Leadership

Enable the provision of exceptional training, mentoring or curricular development and provide fair and committed support for learners, in alignment with the medical school's mission to educate leaders who transform health care and redesign the academic health environment to better society.

B.2 Clinical Expertise

Enable the delivery and measurement of excellent health care, with a focus on quality, health equity, population and/or public health, value, and/or innovation.

B.3 Investigation and Inquiry

Support the development of a rich multidisciplinary environment for research, bringing distinct skills or resources to advance the impact of research, in alignment with the medical school's mission to accelerate innovation and research to improve health.

B.4 Academic and Professional Service

Advance health care through administrative, community, academic, and professional service, in alignment with the medical school's educational, clinical, and research missions.

Section C: Evaluation of Areas of Review

Recommendations for promotion in rank or the granting of tenure shall be made by a formal evaluation of each faculty member, based on the following considerations. Clinical expertise is reviewed only for faculty who provide clinical services.

As noted elsewhere in this policy, regardless of the Area of Excellence, tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to develop and lead a program of scholarship which produces a body of original peer reviewed publications.

In addition, evidence of sustained research funding is expected when applicable to the area of review and field of work.

a. Clinical Expertise

Evidence of expertise and scholarship in a clinical discipline and contributions to clinical practice that are of high quality and significance, including contributions and/or policies that measurably improved the quality and value of patient outcomes and/or population health. A record of leadership in professional societies, membership on editorial boards, development of significant protocols, policies, or technologies, or external recognition or awards received for clinical excellence and/or population or public health is also considered.

b. Educational Leadership

Evidence of expertise and scholarship in teaching and curricular contributions that are of high quality and significance. Teaching may involve medical students, undergraduate and graduate students, residents, fellows, colleagues, and/or learners from other disciplines, and may take a variety of formats, including didactics, precepting, seminars, and clinical supervision. Demonstration of excellence in mentoring and excellent peer-evaluations or student evaluations are expected. A record of invited lectureships, leadership in educational societies or committees, peer-reviewed publications, educational materials developed and used by other institutions, or external recognition or awards received for education, teaching, and mentorship are also considered.

c. Investigation and Inquiry

Evidence of expertise in research and scholarly work that is of high quality and significance. Research may focus on laboratory, population-based, clinical, health services, or educational investigations, resulting in the production of scholarly work that has been published in peer-reviewed journals. A record of invited presentations, external recognition or awards for research, service as an editor and/or on editorial boards of scientific journals, service on committees related to research including grant review panels is also considered.

d. Academic and Professional Service

Academic service is broadly defined as participation in service to the division, department, school, and/or university. Examples include serving on committees, advising students, and involvement or leadership of initiatives to support division, departmental, school, and/or university needs.

Professional service is broadly defined as service to the field or discipline. Examples of professional service include participation in and/or leadership on professional society or field-related committees, boards, panels, etc.; organization of conferences, courses, workshops, or symposia related to the field or discipline, and peer or editorial review for journals.

Section D: Scholarship

The Dell Medical School requires the faculty to be active in scholarship. Scholarship is defined as the creation and/or dissemination of new knowledge. We have adopted Boyer's model of scholarship (Boyer, E. L. (1990), *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching) that expands from traditional research, or the scholarship of discovery, to a broader definition that is more flexible. Boyer's four categories are:

- The scholarship of discovery that involves original research that advances knowledge (i.e., basic research);
- The scholarship of integration that seeks to interpret, analyze, and/or connect original research or creative work. It involves synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics within a discipline, or across time (i.e., review articles, book chapters, interprofessional education, science communication, clinical integration across disciplines and professions, or development of regional or national guidelines);
- The scholarship of application / engagement that involves the rigor and application of disciplinary expertise (i.e., cooperative state research, education, service on national and international committees, leadership in professional societies, invited lectures, recognition as a clinical expert); and
- The scholarship of teaching and learning that involves the systematic study of teaching and learning processes. It differs from scholarly teaching in that it requires a format that will allow public sharing and the opportunity for application and evaluation by others.

Requirements of these expanded models of scholarship are that they go beyond the service duties of a faculty member to those within or outside the University and that their results can be shared with, applied, and/or evaluated by peers.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to develop and lead a program of scholarship that produces a body of original peer-reviewed publications. Most tenured and tenure-track faculty will thus have research as the primary focus of their activities.

Section E: Roles and Responsibilities

E.1 Department Chair and Dean Responsibilities

a. Familiarity with Written Guidelines

Candidates, and all internal reviewers (including executive committee members, department chairs, deans, and APT committee members) must familiarize themselves with these Guidelines and any other written guidelines provided by the school.

b. Unbiased Review

The reviews and recommendations at each level of review must not be positively or negatively influenced by a candidate's race, color, religion, national origin, sex (including pregnancy), age, disability, citizenship, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression. Department chairs and deans should consult with the Provost's Office if any internal or external reviewer expresses a favorable or unfavorable recommendation that could have the appearance of being influenced by any of these immutable characteristics (e.g., a reviewer recommends promotion to increase faculty diversity, etc.).

c. Candidate Meetings

Readiness for promotion review for a tenured associate professor will be determined by the department chair. These discussions with the department chair or their designee should occur each year during the annual evaluation process that is required for all faculty members.

The department chair, or their designee must meet with each candidate in the spring semester prior to the promotion review. The department chair, dean, or designee must:

- Explain the process to the candidate.
- Advise the candidate to become familiar with the applicable guidelines.
- Discuss relative responsibilities for compiling dossier contents.
- Discuss candidate access to the file materials.

d. Selecting Reviewers

A minimum of five external review letters are required for each tenured and tenure-track faculty candidate's promotion review. The department, while working with the candidate, is responsible for developing a list of reviewers. All letters must come from external reviewers from peer institutions/programs who have an understanding of the academic setting and the standards against which the area benchmarks itself. The emphasis of the review is to evaluate the research/scholarly/creative contributions and other accomplishments of the candidate, and to summarize their professional standing.

External reviewers should be selected using the following considerations. Any deviations from these considerations must be thoroughly explained in the Chart of Reviewers:

- Seek out credible reviewers knowledgeable about the scholarly expectations of a peer research university.
- Avoid reviewers who are not arms' length, e.g., dissertation chairs, postdoctoral mentors, co-authors, co-principal investigators, and collaborators.
- Use recognized experts at peer institutions.

- An explanation for any deviations from these considerations (e.g., why a letter writer from a non-peer institution was chosen, etc.) must be provided on the Chart of Reviewers.
- All listed reviewers must be either tenured professors or professors whose body of work and stature is commensurate with tenure. For reviewers who do not have an appointment at the rank of professor with tenure, but who are professors and whose work is considered commensurate with tenure, an explanation regarding how the equivalency of tenured status was determined must be provided.

e. Process for Selecting Reviewers

Prior to sending out the solicitation letter to the external reviewers, the chair or designee shall ask the candidate to provide a list of 4 to 5 names, while also compiling a list of 4 to 5 names of their own. Once compiled, both the candidate and the chair review the list of individuals to be contacted. After considering concerns that may be expressed by the candidate, the department chair in consultation with the dean (or designee), has final say over reviewer selection. The final list should be made up of a mix of candidate and chair selections with the majority coming from the chair selections. The goal is to have the majority of the returned letters to have been designated by the chair (3 out of the 5).

All candidates must be given at least two business days to review the list of reviewers and then the dean (or designee) must approve the final list of letter writers before the solicitation letter is sent. A faculty member is officially a candidate for promotion once external for promotion have been solicited.

Solicitation will include candidate's CV and the Tenure and Tenure-Track Promotion Policy. It is strongly recommended that the solicitation also include: candidate statements, summaries of activities in relevant Area of Excellence and Areas of Review, and significant scholarly works, as applicable.

For candidates who have chosen Clinical Expertise as their Area of Excellence it may be helpful to provide some or all of following information to your letter writers:

- Outcome measurement and attainment compared with peers, incorporation of outcomes to clinical care improvement, areas of clinical expertise critical to health delivery enterprise
- Quality of contributions to clinical practice
- Scholarship in clinical discipline
- Invited lectureship or editorial services
- Development of protocols or technology
- Mentorship of clinical learners
- External recognition (i.e. awards received, etc.)

f. Conflict of Interest:

Any faculty member, department chair, or dean involved in the promotion review (Section A.3) with an actual or potential conflict of interest related to a candidate (e.g., spouse, partner, Ph.D.

advisor, postdoctoral mentor, etc.) must recuse themselves from the review, discussion, and vote on that candidate.

For purposes of this provision, a conflict of interest exists in the following situations:

- A member of the promotion review committees (executive committee or APT committee), the department chair, or the dean was either a respondent or complainant in a University misconduct matter, and the promotion candidate was an opposing party in the same matter (i.e., one was a complainant and the other a respondent)
- The complainant alleged that the respondent's misconduct was directed against or harmed the complainant
- The matter resulted in a finding that the respondent committed a policy violation or engaged in behavior subject to discipline

For purposes of this provision, a potential conflict of interest exists when the Faculty Affairs team, in consultation with the Office of the Vice President of Legal Affairs, determines that the underlying facts in a given scenario cause the appearance of a conflict that undermines University confidence in the fairness of the process. This determination is final.

The dean should contact the provost's Faculty Affairs [team](#) regarding voting eligibility in the event of similar situations that did not result in a finding or that are under investigation at the time of the dossier review.

g. Eligibility to Serve as Department Chair for a Promotion Review:

Individuals serving as department chair for a candidate's promotion review must be free from actual or potential conflict of interest as discussed in (section E.1.f.) and eligible to vote on the promotion case as defined in (section A.4.). In situations in which a department chair is ineligible to serve, the dean in consultation with the Provost's Office will designate a faculty member to serve as the department chair designee for the candidate's review. The department chair designee is authorized to act in the place of the department chair with respect to the actions authorized by these Guidelines and should be designated prior to the start of the promotion review process or immediately after the confirmation of an actual or potential conflict of interest.

h. Eligibility to Serve as Dean for a Promotion Review:

Individuals serving as dean for a candidate's promotion review must be free from actual or potential conflict of interest as discussed in (section E.1.f.) and eligible to vote on the promotion case as defined in (section A.4.). In situations in which a dean is ineligible to serve, the Provost's Office will designate a faculty member to serve as the dean designee for the candidate's review. The dean designee is authorized to act in the place of the dean with respect to the actions authorized by these guidelines and should be designated prior to the start of the promotion review process or immediately after the confirmation of an actual or potential conflict of interest.

i. Participation in Deliberations:

The department chair is to be present for the respective executive committee discussions of each case but does not vote. The dean or their designee must be present for the school committee discussions of each case but does not vote. Department chair and dean are to provide separate assessments of the candidate's contributions and recommended action.

E.2 Candidate's Rights and Responsibilities

a. Dossier Preparation

Candidates should familiarize themselves with these Guidelines and any other written guidelines provided by the school with respect to the promotion process and dossier assembly. Consult with the department chair (or designee) about the relative responsibilities for compiling the information. Candidates have the discretion to include any materials that they believe are relevant to the promotion decision.

b. Review Reviewer List

The candidate shall provide the chair/ executive committee with a list of 4 to 5 recommended individuals to provide peer review letters. The candidate shall review the complete list of individuals selected prior to the dean's (or designee's) approval and prior to the chair sending out the solicitation letters. Concerns about any reviewers on the list may be expressed to the department chair. The department chair will submit the list of possible reviewers to the dean's office for approval. Following the dean's office approval, the department chair has final say over reviewer selection and the majority of the selection needs to be from the chair's designated list. The candidate may place a statement in the dossier to document any concerns they may have regarding reviewer selection.

c. Review of Materials

Before the departmental committee considers a case, the chair shall ask the candidate to check the materials in the promotion dossier. The purpose of this review is to ensure that all candidate materials are enclosed in the dossier as submitted by the candidate. If the candidate believes that the file is incomplete or includes inappropriate material, or if the candidate has any other objection to the process, the chair, dean, or their designee shall either correct the problem or include a statement in the file about the problem and why it was not addressed as the candidate requested. The candidate may also place a statement in the file about the problem or other aspects of the case.

E.3 APT Committee Obligations

The Dell Medical School's Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) committee shall evaluate the credentials and qualifications of faculty members and make recommendations to the dean of the medical school concerning appointments and promotion in rank. The APT committee shall be appointed from among those tenured, tenure-track and professional-track faculty members of the school who hold the rank of professor or associate professor, but who are not department chairs. All votes (i.e., for and against) are to be recorded on the Change in Rank form along with the number ineligible to vote and absent.

E.4 University Obligations

a. Access to Promotion File Materials

Under state law, the university may not keep the contents of the promotion file confidential. A candidate may request and be allowed to inspect any material in their promotion dossier at any time during the promotion process.

i. Informal Access

At any point in the process informal access to the promotion file is available to a candidate upon request as soon as is feasible, but not later than three (3) business days. Requests for informal access are to be addressed to the department chair, dean, or provost, as appropriate, and no formal open records request is required. Candidates shall be allowed to inspect/review their promotion files at each level with adequate supervision. Copying or photographing materials is not permitted, and no materials may be removed from the promotion files.

ii. Formal Access

If the candidate wishes to obtain copies of any materials in the file, the candidate must make a request in writing to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost through the University's Faculty Affairs and Academic Personnel Services [Portal](#).

b. Additions to Dossier

All factual information relied upon in the promotion decision process shall be included in written form in the promotion dossier. All information in the curriculum vitae is considered to be included in the dossier by reference. In addition, information that is available to deans, chairs, and members of the president's committee via University administrative systems (e.g., Workday, Research Management System, Faculty Profile, etc.) may be considered and does not have to be added to the dossier.

If information is added to the promotion dossier after the department chair has asked the candidate to check the materials in the promotion dossier, the date that the information was added must be indicated and the materials must be placed in the Additional Statements folder. The candidate shall be informed of its inclusion and permitted an opportunity to place a statement in the file addressing this addition.

Candidate may add and/or be asked to add new/corrected materials to the dossier after the dossier has been submitted to the Del Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs for APT committee and dean review. Candidate should provide a very brief summary document that explains what the new/corrected material or update is. Candidate may also submit a new CV with relevant update. Candidate will send new/corrected materials to the Office of Faculty Academic Affairs and they will be added to the Additional Statements folder.

All levels of review (executive committee, department chair, APT committee, or dean) having already reviewed the dossier will also be notified of the inclusion of any additional materials. Notification is not necessary for the addition of required statements to the promotion dossier during the regular review process by an executive committee, department chair, APT committee or dean. Should the APT committee recommend an update/correction to the dossier, the faculty member will be informed and given the option to provide updated/corrected information that is then added to the Additional Statements section. The APT committee will be notified of any additions to the Additional Statements section prior to voting on the dossier.

c. Issues beyond the Scope of the Promotion Process

In rare cases, a promotion review may raise issues that the promotion process is not well suited to resolve. For example, an accusation about academic integrity may be relevant to a decision about promotion but may be difficult to resolve adequately in the promotion process. In such

cases, the department chair or dean, in consultation with the provost and president, may delay the promotion process until the matter is resolved by an appropriate body separate from the promotion process.

Section F: Dossier Assembly

Tenured and tenure-track faculty require evaluation in a designated Area of Excellence and a strong record of accomplishments in all remaining areas of review. Dossiers must be assembled with the following specified supporting documentation.

Evidence of clinical expertise is required of all faculty engaged in clinical care, either as the designated Area of Excellence or area of review. Clinical expertise is reviewed only for faculty who provide clinical services.

F.1 Change in Rank Form

All executive committee member, the department chair, APT committee member, and the dean votes and recommendations are recorded on the Change in Rank form. Votes are taken after the evidence is compiled, not before, and repeated voting to achieve unanimity is not endorsed. Only faculty who hold tenure and are at a higher rank than the candidate are eligible to vote. The Office of Faculty Academic Affairs will upload this document to the dossier.

F.2 Dean's Statement

The Dean's statement should not duplicate information found in the chair's statement. This statement must contain the following (in no particular order):

- A summary of the committee's discussion; explanation of the rationale for the committee's vote and resulting recommendation; explanation of negative votes.
- Affirmation for accelerated review (if applicable).
- Independent assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
- Explicit contextualization and assessment of the candidate's scholarly trajectory based on their demonstrated productivity, current and future (where relevant).
- Interpretation of the significance of the external review letters that are received and included in the dossier.
- Clearly stated recommended action, which will be recorded on the change of rank form.

F.3 Department Chair's Statement

- A summary of the executive committee's discussion; explanation of the rationale for the committee's vote and resulting recommendation; explanation of negative votes.
- Description of the standards of excellence in the discipline.
- Explanation for accelerated review (if applicable).
- The statement should discuss activities in the Area of Excellence and areas of review, with a focus on their impact and trajectory. The statement should directly address scholarly contributions as well as clinical activities and impact, service/leadership and impact, educational activities and impact, mentorship and impact, and community-facing scholarship and practice and impact, as applicable.
- For promotion to the rank of associate professor, the Chair's assessment should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an

assistant professor at another institution). Chair's assessment of all other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank.

- Independent assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
- Information about the significance of the candidate's field to the strategic priorities of the department and Dell Med.
- Clearly stated recommended action, which will be recorded on the change of rank form.

F.4 Joint Department Chair's Statement

A department with a candidate holding a joint appointment must assemble and submit a dossier reflecting that department's independent assessment. The involved departments should share materials collected in support of the case. Where only one college is involved, the dossier is consolidated at the dean's office resulting in one college advisory committee vote and one dean's statement. Where two or more colleges are involved, there will be a separate college advisory committee vote and dean's statement.

F.5 Other Statement(s) (if applicable)

Additional statements describing candidate contributions may be provided by unit heads in a variety of circumstances including but not limited to the following examples:

- When a faculty member holds a courtesy appointment and has significant involvement in another department or center.
- When a faculty member is significantly engaged in the unit's activities but does not hold a courtesy appointment.
- Research faculty affiliated with a bureau, academic/research center, laboratory, institute, etc.

F.6 CV

The candidate's dossier is to include a **curriculum vitae** (CV) using the [Dell Medical School CV template](#). This template can be found on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs website. The CV should include the following elements (as applicable):

- All degrees, fields of study, dates awarded
- Professional registrations, licensures, certifications
- All academic employment and/or appointments including track, title series, tenure status and dates of affiliation
- Other Employment
- Honors and Awards
- Professional Memberships and Service
- Educational Activities
- Mentoring
- Advising
- Grants:
 - Funding Status (Current, Under Review, or Completed)
 - Sponsor Name
 - Name and Affiliation of the Principal Investigator
 - Role of the candidate (PI, Multiple PI co-I, site PI, or Key Personnel))
 - Project title

- Project/Funding period
- Funding amount
- If project under review, indicate current status
- Technology Development
- Publications:
 - Publications and other evidence of scholarship/creativity listed according to the kind of entry (e.g. peer-reviewed publications, books & chapters, non-peer-reviewed publications, non-print/online materials)
 - Numbered list in reverse chronological order.
 - Inclusion of PMID or doi is recommended.
 - If an author is a mentee, indicate by *
 - Names of co-authors listed in the order they appear in the publication.
 - Clear designation of the candidate's role if it is not author (e.g. editor, translator, etc.)
 - Works that are in preparation, submitted, under review, accepted but not yet in press, under contract, etc. may also be included.
 - Beginning and ending page numbers for articles (or total number of pages if page numbers are not available) and total number of pages for books and book chapters
- Invited Presentations, which are distinct from abstract presentations
- Academic and Hospital Service
- Government Service
- Community Service

Do **not** duplicate information in the CV in other parts of the dossier unless specified in these guidelines.

F.7 Peer Observation of Teaching

Peer Observation of Teaching is required for all faculty who interact with learners.

Peer observations should be carried out repeatedly in the evaluation period of the candidate (at least 3 should be included in the dossier), ideally in the same class or supervisory situation over the course of multiple academic years. A minimum of 3 peer observations across two or more academic years are required for faculty that designate Educational Leadership as their area of excellence. Particular attention should be paid to giving constructive advice during early observations, then following up with specific progress reports in subsequent semesters. Include in the dossier all reports of peer observations conducted while in rank.

Peer Observation Forms are available on the Dell Medical School Office of Faculty Academic Affairs website. If there is not a form on the website that suits your needs, please contact Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs for assistance. Each peer observation report is to include:

- Number and title of course observed, if applicable
- Date of report
- Date of observation
- Description of methods by which instructor engages students in learning

- Date on which the observation was discussed with the candidate
- Constructive advice
- Any specific improvement from previous peer observation reports
- Name and signature of observer(s)

Resources offered by UT Austin's Faculty Innovation Center regarding Peer Review of Teaching may be found here: <https://facultyinnovate.utexas.edu/opportunities/prof-dev/peer-observation>

F.8 Clinical Expertise

This section includes the supporting documentation required to demonstrate excellence in Clinical Expertise. The section is required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty that have designated Clinical Expertise as their area of excellence or area of review. Clinical expertise is reviewed only for faculty who provide clinical services. All information in the Clinical Expertise section should be compiled into a single PDF document.

F.8.1 Executive Committee Statement

The executive committee must provide a statement assessing activity, impact, and trajectory in clinical expertise and clinical service, with a focus on scholarship (broadly defined), that includes both the signatures and typed names of all the executive committee members. For promotion to the rank of associate professor, committee's assessment should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution). Committee's assessment of all other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank. The document is to provide an explanation of the evaluation procedures and measures used and the assessment should:

- Discuss scholarship – contributions to the development, dissemination, and translation of health professional education, knowledge, and practices and the impact and trajectory of this work.
- Discuss service/leadership – activities that support the University, our broader society, and the faculty member's profession beyond the scope of the faculty member's official responsibilities.
- Discuss relevant evidence of merit or recognition for clinical excellence such as quality metrics, referral base, sustained involvement in committees/task forces related to clinical care, invited presentations, and/or awards.
- Discuss evidence of relevant geographical reputation.
- Discuss educational activity – teaching in the clinic or hospital setting (include detail on learner feedback and peer observation of teaching feedback), curriculum development, participation in departmental, school, university, or professional society educational activities, awards for teaching.
- Discuss mentorship – number and stature of mentees, impact/product(s) of mentoring relationships, awards for mentoring.
- Discuss community-facing scholarship and practice – scholarly contributions to service and community engagement related to improving the health of the community.
- Discuss honors and awards. Note the relative prestige of honors or professional recognitions received and distinguish between those awards made based on promise and those awarded based on accomplishment.
- Discuss trajectory – evidence that the impact of activities is increasing over time.

F.8.2 Candidate Statement

The candidate must provide in four (4) pages or less a candidate statement of contributions and achievements in clinical expertise and clinical service, with a focus on scholarship (broadly defined), during the requisite time in rank. The statement should discuss activity, impact, and trajectory of scholarship, service/leadership, educational activities, mentorship, community-facing scholarship and practice. Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution). All other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank.

F.8.3 Summary of Clinical Activities

Tenured and tenure-track candidates must include activities for the entire probationary period or time in rank as applicable. It is important to include annotated descriptions of each activity and candidate's role in the activity and time commitment of the activity. Examples of Summaries of Clinical Activities can be found on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs website.

F.8.4 Honors and Awards

The candidate should identify any honors or professional recognitions received for Clinical Expertise. If candidates took a program or course and received a certificate, this is not viewed as an award. Certificates can be placed in the supplemental folder section of the dossier.

F.9 Educational Leadership

This section includes the supporting documentation required to demonstrate excellence in Educational Leadership. The section is required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty that have designated Educational Leadership as their area of excellence or area of review. All information in the educational leadership section should be compiled into a single PDF document.

F.9.1 Executive Committee Statement

The executive committee must provide a statement assessing activity, impact, and trajectory in educational leadership, with a focus on scholarship (broadly defined), that includes both the signatures and typed names of all executive committee members. For promotion to the rank of associate professor, committee's assessment should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution). Committee's assessment of all other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank. The document is to provide an explanation of the evaluation procedures and measures used and the assessment should:

- Discuss scholarship – contributions to the development, dissemination, and translation of health professional education, knowledge, and practices.
- Discuss service/leadership in education – activities that support the University, our broader society, and the faculty member's profession beyond the scope of the faculty member's official responsibilities.
- Discuss educational activity – didactic and/or clinical teaching (include detail on learner feedback and peer observation of teaching feedback), curriculum development, participation in departmental, school, university, or professional society educational activities, awards for teaching.

- Discuss mentorship – number and stature of mentees, impact/product(s) of mentoring relationships, awards for mentoring.
- Discuss community-facing scholarship and practice – scholarly contributions to service and community engagement related to improving the health of the community.
- Discuss honors and awards. Note the relative prestige of honors or professional recognitions received and distinguish between those awards made based on promise and those awarded based on accomplishment.
- Discuss trajectory – evidence that the impact of activities is increasing over time.

F.9.2 Candidate Statement

The candidate must provide in four (4) pages or less a candidate statement of contributions and achievements in educational leadership, with a focus on scholarship (broadly defined), during the requisite time in rank. The statement should discuss activity, impact, and trajectory of scholarship, service/leadership, educational activities (inclusive of reflection and development growth from peer observation of teaching reports), mentorship, community-facing scholarship and practice. Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution). All other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank.

F.9.3 Summary of Instructional Activities

Tenured and tenure-track candidates must include activities for the entire probationary period or time in rank, as applicable. The summary should include didactic, seminar and bedside teaching for medical students, graduate students, and trainees. If the candidate has supervised graduate students or postdoctoral fellows, this section must include a list of the names of those supervised. For postdoctoral fellows supervised, candidates must list the fellow's name, institution awarding the PhD, and date conferred. It is important to include annotated descriptions of each activity and candidate's role in the activity and the time committed to the activity. Examples of Summaries of Instructional Activities can be found on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs website.

F.9.4 Honors and Awards

The candidate should identify any honors or professional recognitions received for Educational Leadership. If candidates took a program or course and received a certificate, this is not viewed as an award. Certificates can be placed in the supplemental folder section of the dossier.

F.10 Investigation and Inquiry

This section includes the supporting documentation required to demonstrate excellence in Investigation and Inquiry. The section is required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty that have designated Investigation and Inquiry as their area of excellence or area of review. All information in the Investigation and Inquiry section should be compiled into a single PDF document.

F.10.1 Executive Committee Statement

The executive committee must provide a statement assessing activity, impact, and trajectory of the research/scholarly/creative contributions that includes both the typed names and signatures

of all executive committee members. For promotion to the rank of associate professor, committee's assessment should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution). Committee's assessment of all other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank. The document is to provide an explanation of the evaluation procedures and measures used and the assessment should:

- Describe which area(s) of the field is the focus of the faculty member's work;
- Identify and comment on those items that are considered to be of major significance or outstanding quality while in rank at UT Austin or since the most recent promotion, as appropriate;
- Include a brief statement of the basis for qualitative judgments in the area or discipline;
- Discuss scholarship – contributions to the development, dissemination, and translation of health professional education, knowledge, and practices. Be clear about the norms of the field and indicate, for example, the quality of the outlets for a candidate's work (e.g., journals, presses, art galleries, performance venues, etc.); Explain the norms of co-authorship, where applicable, and whether a peer review was involved;
- Describe how the candidate's research fits within the context of their field and explain it in a way that is accessible to those outside of their field.
- Discuss service/leadership in research – activities that support the University, our broader society, and the faculty member's profession beyond the scope of the faculty member's official responsibilities.
- Discuss funding record – success and trajectory in obtaining competitive external funding (as applicable for rank and title series) to support their research.
- Discuss educational activity – lectures, grand rounds, seminars, tutorials, etc. related to area of research expertise (include detail on learner feedback and peer observation of teaching feedback).
- Discuss mentorship – number and stature of mentees, impact/product(s) of mentoring relationships, awards for mentoring.
- Discuss community-facing scholarship and practice – scholarly contributions to service and community engagement related to improving the health of the community.
- Discuss honors and awards in research. Note the relative prestige of honors or professional recognitions received and distinguish between those awards made based on promise and those awarded based on accomplishment.
- Discuss trajectory – evidence that the impact of activities is increasing over time.

F.10.2 Candidate Statement

The candidate must provide in four (4) pages or less a candidate statement of contributions and achievements in investigation and inquiry during the requisite time in rank. The [NIH Relative Citation Ration \(RCR\) index](#) must be included in the candidate statement for Investigation and Inquiry as a link to the faculty member's iCite profile. The statement should discuss activity, impact, and trajectory of scholarship, service/leadership, funding record, educational activities (inclusive of reflection and developmental growth from peer observation of teaching reports), mentorship, community-facing scholarship and practice.

In terms of impact of scholarship, the candidate statement must provide detail that contextualizes the caliber of outlets (e.g., press, journal, conference, exhibition space, etc.) in

which their research, scholarship, and creative endeavors have appeared in rank. This contextualization can include a description of the ranking of the impact of the outlet or other measures (if available) to help describe the outlet's quality.

Actively seeking and successfully obtaining external funding is a consideration for promotion and success in funding must be addressed in the candidate's statement. Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution) and are encouraged to articulate a plan for sustaining their program. All other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank.

F.10.3 List of Five Most Significant Works Completed in Rank

The candidate must identify the five most significant works completed while in their current rank. The candidate must provide a list of those works using the [University template](#). For each of the works that is co-authored, the candidate must include the following information:

- If any of the co-authors were former mentees of the candidate (e.g., graduate students or postdoctoral researchers), the names of those co-authors must be italicized.
- If any of the co-authors were graduate advisors or postdoctoral mentors of the candidate, the names of those co-authors must be highlighted.
- Provide a brief indication of the relationship between each co-author and the candidate (e.g., current or former student, postdoctoral mentee, peer faculty member, or senior faculty member), and the affiliation of each co-author at the time that the paper was submitted for review.
- Include a brief qualitative statement of the candidate's contribution to the work.
- Provide a brief statement about the choice of publication/performance venue for this work.

F.10.4 Honors and Awards

The candidate should identify any honors or professional recognitions received for their research or scholarly work. If candidates took a program or course and received a certificate, this is not viewed as an award. Certificates can be placed in the supplemental folder section of the dossier.

F.11 Academic and Professional Service

This section includes the supporting documentation required to demonstrate a record of and evidence supporting a future trajectory of excellence in terms of academic and professional service. This section is required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

F.11.1 Executive Committee Statement

The executive committee must provide a statement assessing the quality of the candidate's performance, contributions, leadership, impact and trajectory with respect to academic and professional service (at the level of their academic program, department, school, and/or university), academic and professional organizations, and/or community that includes both the signatures and typed names of all executive committee members. The statement should:

- Discuss the candidate's contributions in academic and professional service during the entire probationary period or time in rank, as applicable.

- Discuss the nature of activities cited in support of the recommendation, and assess the quality of the service contributions.
- Discuss the candidate's service in scholarly or professional organizations and its significance.
- Discuss the candidate's honors or professional recognitions received and distinguish between those awards made based on promise and those based on accomplishment.

F.11.2 Candidate Statement on Academic and Professional Service

The candidate must provide in four (4) pages or less a statement summarizing record of and evidence supporting contributions, performance and trajectory of excellence in terms of academic and professional service. Candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments during probationary period or while in rank, as applicable.

F.11.3. Summary of Administrative and Professional Service Activities

Candidates must prepare a summary of administrative and professional service activities during the probationary period or while in rank, as applicable. It is important to include annotated descriptions of each activity, candidate's role in the activity, and time commitment of the activity. Positions of leadership should be noted along with honors or professional recognitions received for service work. Examples of Summaries of Academic and Professional Service Activities can be found on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs website.

F.12 Review Letters

A minimum of five external review letters that evaluate the contributions and accomplishments of the candidate must be included in the dossier.

F.13 Chart of Reviewers

All solicited review letters received concerning a candidate must be included in the candidate's dossier. The department is to prepare a Chart of Reviewers solicited using the Chart of Reviewers [template](#) provided by the Provost's Office. Group by Received, Declined, and No Response, and list in alphabetical order by last name within each group providing the following information:

- Name and rank or title of reviewer;
- Name of institution (including the department) with which the reviewer is affiliated;
- Brief statement about why the individual was selected; Confirm that the external reviewer is arms-length.
- Other relevant information about the reviewer that would assist those involved in the process who are not practitioners in the candidate's field;
- Indicate whether selected by department or candidate;
- Indicate date received for letters and declinations;
- Include the reason for declination, if provided; and
- Include an explanation for any deviations from those considerations listed.

F.14 Sample Solicitation Letter

Sample letters for departments and schools to use in soliciting letters from reviewers are available from the Dell Medical School Office of Faculty Academic Affairs. Departments may tailor these letters to their

individual circumstances. However, all reviewers must be informed that, under Texas law, we cannot ensure the confidentiality of letters from reviewers.

Reviewers also must be informed of any approved personal circumstances flag (sample letters include recommended text). The intent of this information is to alert reviewers to the relevant time frame to use in their review of the candidate.

F.15 List of Materials sent to Reviewer

Provide a listing of all materials (e.g., CV, candidate statements and summaries of activities, names of significant works) that were sent to the reviewers to facilitate their evaluation of the candidate.

F.16 Letters Received

Place the letters in alphabetical order by last name. Make note in the upper right-hand corner of the first page of each letter whether the department or candidate, or both, nominated the letter writer. This notation should match the information provided on chart of reviewers.

All solicited letters received must be included in the candidate's dossier. A short version of the reviewer's CV is to be included behind each letter.

F.17 Declinations

Place any declination correspondence in alphabetical order by last name behind the letters received. A CV is not required.

F.18 Additional Statements

Any additional statements added to the file as a result of the candidate's review before executive committee deliberations or received after the candidate's review shall be date stamped and placed in the Additional Statements folder.

F.19 Supplemental Materials (if applicable)

Supplemental materials shall accompany the promotion file at each level of review and be made available to all internal parties to whom its content is relevant for their review, deliberations and/or vote.

F.19.1 Learner Evaluations

The candidate must provide a summary of all learner evaluations while in rank, grouped by course or experience and listed in chronological order. These will be placed in the supplemental folder in the following order: medical student evaluations, resident evaluations, and continuing medical education evaluations. Please clearly label each with a header.

F.19.2 Letters Solicited from Collaborators

The department is to prepare a separate chart of reviewers for letters solicited from collaborators, listed in alphabetical order by last name, using the template provided by the Provost's Office. Letters solicited from collaborators must be placed behind the chart of reviewers in a section separate from those solicited from arm's length reviewers and will not count toward the minimum number of letters that are required. A CV is not required.

F.19.3 Other Supplemental Materials

In addition to the required materials described in these Guidelines, candidates have the discretion to include any materials that they believe are relevant to the promotion or tenure decision. Provide a table of contents as a coversheet to the other supplemental materials.

F.19.4 Five Most Significant Works

Required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty. The candidate is to make the selection of the five most significant works while in their probationary period or current rank, as applicable, and provide an introductory paragraph for each work that tells the significance of the work and its impact on the field. Include a listing of the five works in the dossier.

The five most significant works will be placed with the other supplemental materials, not in the dossier.

F.19.5 Selected Instructional Materials (Teaching Portfolio)

Required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty. The candidate is to include selectively chosen examples of instructional or curricular materials appropriate for a teaching portfolio, such as syllabi, handouts, problem sets, and other written materials developed for courses; computer-assisted instructional aids; examinations. These materials do not accompany the dossier beyond the dean's office. If the candidate mentions a specific course or material that was disseminated to students in their teaching statement, it is best to include a copy of it in this section.

F.19.6 Selected Clinical Innovations

The candidate is to include selectively chosen examples of materials, clinical innovations or other scholarly work and summarize (one page or less) the impact of these works on the mission of Dell Medical School.

Section G: Outcomes

G.1 President Conferences

The promotion dossiers will be reviewed and discussed by the president's review committee. The dean will attend a promotion review meeting with the president's review committee to discuss the school's candidates. In some cases, in order to make a determination in the best interest of the University, the president may request that formal assessments of a candidate's contributions and achievements be sought from additional experts in the field, or that key stakeholders be invited to address questions not resolved by the record presented or in the conference with the dean.

G.2 Announcement of Decisions

The Office of the President will formally notify the dean of the results of the promotion conferences, including those pending cases where an action of terminal appointment is being considered. Candidates will be notified of the president's decision in February.

G.3 Final Arguments in Terminal Appointment Pending Cases

Only tenure-track candidates who receive notice of a terminal appointment pending may present final arguments in writing to the president before the case is decided. Final arguments provide candidates with

an opportunity to write directly to the president regarding the merits of their case. It is helpful, but not required, for the candidate to succinctly address any perceived weaknesses in the file as well as provide any new or additional evidence that has become available since the file was compiled and submitted for review. Address final arguments to the president and deliver an electronic copy to the provost via <https://ut.service-now.com/evpp> by a date to be determined in 2025.

The president will refer the written arguments to the dean and department chair for comment and to members of the president's review committee for review and discussion, prior to making a final decision.

G.4 Request for Review by the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom & Responsibility (CCAFR)

The candidate or the president may request a review of the case by the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR). Such a review is limited to one or both of the following:

1. To determine whether, in its judgment, the procedures followed in the candidate's case accorded with both the University's and commonly accepted professional standards for promotion and tenure; and
2. whether the decision was based upon a violation of the faculty member's academic freedom.

CCAFR shall not review disputes about professional judgments on the merits of the faculty member's record.

A request for review shall describe the procedural irregularity being asserted and/or the alleged violation of academic freedom being asserted and how it impacted the decision. Candidates have until [2025 Date TBD], to submit a request for review to the chair of CCAFR and provide an electronic copy to the provost via <https://ut.service-now.com/evpp>. The Provost's Office will distribute copies of the request to the dean and department chair.

CCAFR may delegate its work to a subcommittee of no fewer than three members. CCAFR shall report to the president, with a copy to the candidate, by [2025 Date TBD]. The president will consider the subcommittee's report and advise CCAFR of the outcome of the case. The president may extend the time for the subcommittee to perform its work.

G.5 Grievances

Nothing in this document is intended to alter a candidate's right to use the University's existing grievance processes as described in HOP 2-2310 and Regents' Rule 31008.

G.6 Resources

- For assistance with the General Guidelines or the promotion and tenure process generally: Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost at <https://ut.service-now.com/evpp>.
- To speak with a neutral third party about individual concerns: Faculty Ombuds at facombud@austin.utexas.edu.
- For questions about procedural or academic freedom concerns: Chair of the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR).
- For questions about the Faculty Grievance Procedure: Faculty Grievance Committee

G.7 HOP, Regents' Rules, State and Federal Law

The UT Austin Handbook of Operating Procedures, the UT System Regents' Rules, state and federal law take precedence over these Guidelines. Note that if a policy in the relevant UT Austin Handbook of Operating Procedures is under revision then the candidate and reviewers should address questions to the provost's Faculty Affairs team at <https://ut.service-now.com/evpp>.

Section H: Appendix

H.1 Summary of Dossier Preparation – Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Instructions:

Please follow the file naming convention below. Please do not include the candidate's name in the file names. These will be organized inside a UT Box folder with the candidate's name.

When uploading files to UT Box, please be sure to only upload one version of each document. If you have to upload more than one version, you will need to clear out the extra versions before submitting to the Office of Faculty Academic Affairs. To avoid this, delete the old version from the Box file before uploading a new version.

DOSSIER FOLDER

PDF File Name in UT Box	PDF Document Contents
01_Change in Rank Form.pdf	Change in Rank Form <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office of Faculty Academic Affairs will upload to the dossier.
02_Dean Statement.pdf	Statement from Dean <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office of Faculty Academic Affairs will upload to the dossier.
03_Chair Statement.pdf	Statement from Department Chair of Primary Department
04_Mid-Probationary Review.pdf	Copy of Mid-Probationary Review Summary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only applicable for tenure-track candidates Office of Faculty Academic Affairs will upload to the dossier.
05a,b,c_Other Statement_CSU Title.pdf	Statement from the joint, courtesy, or other Department Chair/Center Director (if applicable) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statements from joint or courtesy Department Chairs should appear before statements from other departments.
06_CV.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated CV using Dell Med CV template
07_Educational Leadership.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive Committee Statement with typed names of and signatures of all committee members. Candidate Statement (4 pages or less. Does not have to be signed.)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of Instructional Activities • Honors and Awards <p>Please note: learner evaluations, teaching certifications, and selected instructional materials go in the Supplemental Materials folder.</p>
08_Clinical Expertise.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Committee Statement with typed names of and signatures of all committee members. • Candidate Statement (4 pages or less. Does not have to be signed.) • Summary of Clinical Activities • Patient Outcomes • Honors and Awards
09_Investigation and Inquiry.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Committee Statement with typed names of and signatures of all committee members. • Candidate Statement (4 pages or less. Does not have to be signed. Must include NIH RCR index.) • List of Five Most Significant Works Completed in Rank: Tenure-track and tenured candidates must identify the five most significant works completed in rank and provide a list using the List of Five Most Significant Works template. • Honors and Awards
10_Academic and Professional Service.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Committee Statement with typed names of and signatures of all committee members. • Candidate Statement (4 pages or less. Does not have to be signed.) • Summary of Administrative and Professional Service Activities • Honors and Awards
11_Chart of Reviewers.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped by Received, Declined, and No Response • Reviewers listed in alphabetical order by last name within each group. Use the Chart of Reviewers Template. • Sample of Solicitation Letter/Email • List of Materials: separate page within this PDF that includes the header “List of Materials Sent to Reviewer” and lists the materials sent to the reviewer. All materials that were sent to the reviewers (except the CV) will be included here. <p>Please note: CV can be listed as material sent to reviewer. But DO NOT include CV in this PDF.</p>
12a,b,c_ltr_Last name-Institution.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place individual letters in alphabetical order by last name. • Each letter should include a header in upper right-hand corner of the first page that indicates whether the Candidate, Executive Committee, or Chair nominated the

	<p>external reviewer. This information must match what is listed on the Chart of Reviewers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each letter should include CV of external reviewer.
13_Declinations.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All declinations correspondence placed in alphabetical order by last name (if received). CV is not required.
14_Unsolicited.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All unsolicited letters in alphabetical order by last name (if received). CV is not required. These do not need to be filed individually. They should all be in one PDF.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS FOLDER

This is a separate folder that should only be created if applicable.

PDF File Name in UT Box	PDF Document Contents
01_Additional Statement_ccyy-dd-mm_Last Name.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any non-required statements or information added to the file as a result of the candidate's review or received during the course of the review process. The last name in the file name refers to who wrote the statement, i.e. Chair or Candidate.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS FOLDER

PDF File Name in UT Box	PDF Document Contents
01a,b,c_Student Comments_Semester NameYY-Course#.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each set of student comments should be separate PDF document.
<p>02_Five Most Significant Works Completed in Rank (FOLDER)</p> <p>File naming convention:</p> <p>01_List of five significant works</p> <p>02_Short_title for first significant work through</p> <p>06_Short_title for the fifth significant work</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PDF describing the five most significant works created using the List of Five Most Significant Works template. Required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty. Texts of each of the five most significant works: the full text of the five most significant works completed in rank, must be included as separated PDFs.
03_Letters Solicited from Collaborators.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chart of collaborators listed in alphabetical order by last name. Can use the Chart of Reviewers Template. All solicited letters placed in alphabetical order by last name after the chart of collaborators. CV is not required.
04_Letters Solicited from Mentees.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chart of mentees listed in alphabetical order by last name. Can use the Chart of Reviewers Template. All solicited letters placed in alphabetical order by last name after the chart of mentees. CV is not required.
05_Other Supplemental Materials.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Items submitted by the candidate. Should include a table of contents with very brief description/relevance of items.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certificates from completed courses, if applicable.
06a,b,c_Learner Evaluations_(Medical Student, Resident, Fellow, CME).pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learner evaluations from medical students, residents, fellows, CME. • Each PDF should include a header in upper right-hand corner of the first page that indicates the type of learner evaluation: medical student, resident, fellow, CME, etc.
07_Peer Observation of Teaching.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer Observation of Teaching reports while in rank. (Stay in Dean's Office)
08_Selected Instructional Materials.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of Teaching Portfolio: selectively chosen examples of instructional or curricular materials. • Required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty .
09_Selected Clinical Innovations.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of materials, clinical innovations, or other scholarly works.

Addendum: Managing Dossier Preparation for Faculty with Joint Appointments

This section applies to faculty holding a joint appointment between departments within the Dell Medical School and faculty holding a joint appointment with another college or school at the University (regardless of whether the primary appointment is in Dell Medical School or the other school/college).

Joint Appointment of Less Than 30%

Faculty members holding one or more joint appointments of less than 30% are reviewed only in the academic unit corresponding to the primary appointment. The department chair, dean, or faculty member may request the following from the academic unit(s) corresponding to the joint appointment(s): (a) input regarding selection of external reviewers, (b) participation by eligible faculty in writing the required budget council/executive committee statements, (c) letter from the department chair or dean evaluating the faculty member's contributions to the secondary academic unit(s), and (d) optional contributions that may be added to the supplemental materials section of the dossier.