

Dell Medical School 2024-25 Guidelines for Promotion Professional-Track Faculty

Table of Contents

Section A: Overview	4
A.1 Introduction.....	4
A.2 Professional-Track Title Series	5
A.3 Levels of Review	5
A.4 Eligibility to Vote on a Promotion Review Committee	5
A.5 Minimum Number of Eligible Voting Members for Promotion Review Committees.....	5
A.6 Managing Joint Appointments.....	6
A.7 Effective Years in Rank	6
A.8 Minimum Amount of Qualifying Service at UT Austin.....	6
A.9 Electing to Combine Service at UT Austin with Time Worked at Prior Institution(s)	7
A.10 Sample Timelines for On-Time Promotion Review	7
A.11 Accelerated Review	7
A.12 Invoking the Right of Consideration to be a Candidate for Promotion Review	8
A.13 Possible Outcomes Following Considerations for Promotion	8
Section B: Areas of Excellence	8
B.1 Clinical Expertise	9
B.2 Educational Leadership	9
B.3 Investigation and Inquiry	9
Section C: Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise.....	9
C.1 Evaluation of Additional Contributions.....	9
Section D: Scholarship	10
Section E: Roles and Responsibilities.....	11
E.1 Department Chair and Dean Responsibilities	11
E.2 Candidate's Rights and Responsibilities	14
E.3 APT Committee Obligations.....	15
E.4 University Obligations.....	15

Section F: Dossier Assembly	16
F.1 Change in Rank Form	16
F.2 Dean's Statement	16
F.3 Department Chair's Statement	17
F.4 Joint Department Chair's Statement	17
F.5 Other Statement(s) (if applicable)	17
F.6 CV	18
F.7 Peer Observation of Teaching	19
F.8 Clinical Expertise	19
F.8.1 Executive Committee Statement	19
F.8.2 Candidate Statement	20
F.8.3 Summary of Clinical Activities	20
F.8.4 Honors and Awards	20
F.9 Educational Leadership	20
F.9.1 Executive Committee Statement	21
F.9.2 Candidate Statement	21
F.9.3 Summary of Instructional Activities	21
F.9.4 Honors and Awards	22
F.10 Investigation and Inquiry	22
F.10.1 Executive Committee Statement	22
F.10.2 Candidate Statement	23
F.10.3 List of Five Most Significant Works Completed in Rank	23
F.10.4 Honors and Awards	24
F.11 Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise	24
F.11.1 Executive Committee Statement	24
F.11.2 Candidate Statement on Additional Contributions	24
F.11.3. Summaries of Additional Contributions	25
F.12 Review Letters	25
F.13 Chart of Reviewers	25
F.14 Sample Solicitation Letter	26
F.15 List of Materials sent to Reviewer	26
F.16 Letters Received	26
F.17 Declinations	26

F.18	Additional Statements	26
F.19	Supplemental Materials (if applicable)	26
F.19.1	Learner Evaluations	26
F.19.2	Letters Solicited from Collaborators	26
F.19.3	Other Supplemental Materials	27
F.19.4	Five Most Significant Works	27
F.19.5	Selected Instructional Materials (Teaching Portfolio)	27
F.19.6	Selected Clinical Innovations	27
Section G:	Outcomes	27
G.1	President Conferences	27
G.2	Announcement of Decisions	27
G.3	Request for Review by the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom & Responsibility (CCAFR)	28
G.4	Grievances	28
G.5	Resources	28
G.6	HOP, Regents' Rules, State and Federal Law	28
Section H:	Appendix	29
H.1	Summary of Dossier Preparation – Professional-Track Faculty	29
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 process, preparation of materials, and management of dossiers for promotion of professional-track faculty of the Dell Medical School. See also the Professional-Track Promotion Policy on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs website.

The Dell Medical School's professional-track is meant to provide a pathway for educators, clinicians and research scientists to be recognized for their scholarly work, expertise, and contributions to the school and University. The Dell Medical School supports and encourages its faculty in these activities, recognizing that most of its faculty will have clinical or other obligations that make progression on the tenure-track impracticable. Professional-track faculty are the backbone of the medical school's teaching, education, clinical, and community service missions who the school wishes to recognize through attainment of and progression through professional-track academic rank outside of the traditional expectations of the tenure-track process.

A.2 Professional-Track Title Series

Professional-track faculty appointments in the Dell Medical School will be in either the Professor title series or the Clinical Professor title series based on their contributions to and work in their department.

a. Professional-Track Assistant, Associate, Professor Title Series

Faculty appointed to this title series are expected to play an active and sustained key role in a program of scholarship in an area of expertise, which includes traditional outputs of scholarship (e.g., peer-reviewed publications) in the designated Area of Excellence and garners a reputation beyond the University.

b. Professional-Track Clinical Assistant, Clinical Associate, Clinical Professor Title Series

Faculty appointed to this title series are expected to demonstrate active participation in the academic mission of Dell Medical School and active engagement in scholarly activities that derive from and support clinical, teaching, and/or professional service activities. Scholarship is defined broadly and peer-reviewed publications are not required.

A.3 Levels of Review

Professional-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 for all professional-track candidates.

A.4 Eligibility to Vote on a Promotion Review Committee

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

- Only faculty at a higher rank than the candidate may vote on promotion review for candidates, regardless of tenure status.
- 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 review may only vote once.

A.5 Minimum Number of Eligible Voting Members for Promotion 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 case considered. In cases where there are fewer than five eligible voting faculty members on the promotion review committee, all existing committee members will participate in the promotion review and ad hoc reviewers, who meet the voting eligibility criteria, will be invited to participate and vote in the promotion 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 facets of the candidate's additional contributions to the academic enterprise.

A.6 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 one year 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 additional contributions to the academic enterprise along with expectations for promotion may be different in each school and/or college. Deans from each college or school must make independent recommendations regarding promotion of the candidate.

A.7 Effective Years in Rank

The annual review cycle for promotion dossiers begins in the fall following a schedule and policies set forth by the University. In general, promotion to associate professor requires seven effective years of service in rank at assistant professor, and promotion to professor requires seven effective years of service in rank at associate professor in order to be considered an on-time promotion.

Professional-track faculty accrue one year of service at UT Austin when at least nine months of full-time academic service has been completed during the University's academic year (September 1 – August 31). An academic year does not count as an effective year in rank if the professional-track faculty member has an approved personal circumstances flag associated with that year.

If a professional-track faculty member is reclassified from one title series to another during their career at UT Austin, then the number of effective years in rank is not reset at the time of a reclassification. Therefore, a faculty member with three effective years in rank as an Assistant Professor of Medicine and three effective years in rank as a Clinical Assistant Professor of Medicine has accumulated six effective years in rank.

A.8 Minimum Amount of Qualifying Service at UT Austin

All candidates for promotion must complete a minimum of two effective years in rank at UT Austin before the start of the academic year in which their promotion case is reviewed by the school APT Committee.

A.9 Electing to Combine Service at UT Austin with Time Worked at Prior Institution(s)

Candidates who were appointed as a professional-track (or equivalent) faculty member at the equivalent rank at one or more other institutions immediately prior to their appointment as a professional-track faculty member at UT Austin may elect to combine effective years in rank at UT Austin with no more than 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:

- The minimum required effective years in rank at UT Austin.
- If the candidate has designated Educational Leadership as their Area of Excellence, then 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 Academic Affairs that they have elected to be considered under the combined service option no later than February 1st in the year immediately preceding the review. The Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs will then send the request to the Provost's Office.

The candidate's record of combined service will be evaluated using the same expectations as if the candidate had completed all effective years in rank at UT Austin. Promoting a faculty member must be in the best interest of the department, school, and University.

A.10 Sample Timelines for On-Time Promotion Review

There is no mandatory review for professional-track faculty, so that timing of promotion review may occur later than the years indicated in Table 1. Promotion review prior to the timelines in Table 1 are considered accelerated.

Table 1. Sample Promotion Timelines for Professional-Track Faculty		
	No Joint Appointment	Joint Appointment with Another College or School at the University
Year of Dossier Prep	6 th year in rank	5 th year in rank
Year of Review	7 th year in rank	6 th year in rank
Year promotion is effective	September 1 of 8 th year in rank	September 1 of 7 th year in rank

A.11 Accelerated Review

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

Accelerated cases must be fully explained and justified by the dean and department chair and should only be put forward for review when a compelling case can be made that the

candidate's record and potential for continuing excellence is truly exceptional in their designated Area of Excellence and in their additional contributions to the academic enterprise, and that accelerated promotion is in the University's best interest.

In most cases, the University will benefit from the evidence gathered from fulfillment of the entire number of effective years in rank or of elected combined service to satisfy an on-time review prior to making a promotion 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 to be a Candidate for Promotion Review

Except when subject to restrictions imposed by disciplinary sanctions, professional-track faculty members 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 professional-track faculty candidate 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 professional-track faculty candidate not be promoted after invoking their right of consideration for promotion review, then
 - ii. The professional-track faculty 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 professional-track faculty 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 Possible Outcomes Following Considerations for Promotion

Upon consideration for promotion the executive committee(s) or equivalent governing committee(s), and department chair(s) of their department(s), Dell Medical School Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, and dean shall recommend:

- a. That they be promoted in rank; or
- b. That promotion be denied and they remain at the current rank.

Section B: Areas of Excellence

The Dell Medical School defines three Areas of Excellence for professional-track faculty that align with its mission, with promotion in these Areas based on pre-established guidelines for achievement set by the medical school. Professional-track faculty require evaluation in a designated Area of Excellence and of

their additional contributions to the academic enterprise that do not fall under their designated Area of Excellence.

Evidence of clinical expertise is required of all faculty engaged in clinical care, either as the designated Area of Excellence or as a part of additional contributions to the academic enterprise. Clinical expertise is reviewed only for faculty who provide clinical services.

B.1 Clinical Expertise

Enable the delivery and measurement of innovative and value-focused care, in alignment with the medical school's mission to evolve new models of person-centered, multidisciplinary care that reward value.

B.2 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.3 Investigation and Inquiry

Enable 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.

Section C: Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise

A record of and evidence supporting a future trajectory of excellence in terms of active, additional contributions to the academic enterprise more generally must also be clearly demonstrated and is reviewed. The additional contributions to the academic enterprise might be made at the intersection of one or more of the areas of excellence.

Activities in the area of Academic and Professional Service that faculty are engaged in that do not fall within their designated Area of Excellence must be included as a part of additional contributions to the academic enterprise.

For faculty engaged in clinical care who do not have Clinical Expertise as their designated Area of Excellence, their clinical activities must be included as a part of additional contributions to the academic enterprise. Additional contributions to the academic enterprise offered by the candidate cannot repeat use of accomplishments and performance in the Area of Excellence.

C.1 Evaluation of Additional Contributions

a. 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.

b. 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 are also considered.

c. Investigation and Inquiry

Evidence of expertise in research and scholarly work that is of high quality and significance. Work 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 and the demonstration of a financially sustainable line of investigation. A record of local, regional, national, and/or international invited presentations, external recognition or awards for research, service as an editor and/or on editorial boards of scientific journals, service on regional, national, and international committees related to research including grant review panels are also considered.

d. Academic and Professional Service

Academic and Professional Service is not an Area of Excellence, but activities in this area that do not fall within the candidate's Area of Excellence are reviewed as a part of additional contributions to the academic enterprise. Service may include advising, counseling and other student services; administrative committee service on an institutional, local, regional, national, and/or international level; a strong record of public service to the community, state, and nation; and other evidence of merit or recognition, such as fellowships, grants, honors, and election to office in scholarly or professional organizations.

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 and includes the new societal and environmental challenges beyond the campus but also the certainty of contemporary life. 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 involves synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics within a discipline, or across time (i.e., 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 regional or national 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.

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 will be determined by the department chair. Discussions between faculty members and 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 three letters from reviewers are required for each professional-track faculty candidate's promotion review.

- Professional-track Professor title series: At least 2 of the 3 letters must be external and arms' length. One letter may be internal.
- Professional-track Clinical Professor title series: All 3 letters may be internal.

The department, while working with the candidate, is responsible for developing a list of reviewers. For professional-track faculty, the reviewers must be capable of objectively assessing the candidate's merit for promotion without bias or personal or professional conflict of interest. For this reason, letters from those who have served as a mentor, training supervisor or significant collaborator will not count as one of the 3 required letters.

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

- Reviewers must have no actual or potential conflict of interest related to the candidate (e.g., spouse, partner, Ph.D. advisor, etc.)
- Reviewers must be able to evaluate the faculty member's performance, contributions and trajectory related to either the candidate's primary area of specialization and/or the candidate's additional contributions to the academic enterprise.
- Reviewers must be at a higher rank than the candidate and knowledgeable about expectations for promotion in the relevant title series.
- If a component of the candidate's contributions to the academic enterprise includes teaching, faculty members who served as peer observers of teaching may also serve as internal reviewers. However, their review must provide a holistic review of the candidate's accomplishments, performance and trajectory in rank, rather than repeating the peer observation report.

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 at arms' length, e.g., dissertation chairs, postdoctoral mentors, co- 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 at the rank the candidate is pursuing or higher.

e. Process for Selecting Reviewers

Prior to sending out the solicitation letter to the 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 (2 out of the 3).

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 or internal reviews for promotion have been solicited.

Solicitation will include candidate's CV and the Professional-Track Promotion Policy. It is strongly recommended that the solicitation also include: candidate statements and summaries of activities in relevant Area of Excellence.

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 and/or dean delegate is to 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 the 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

Professional-track faculty require evaluation in a designated Area of Excellence (Clinical Expertise, Educational Leadership, or Investigation and Inquiry) and of their additional contributions to the academic enterprise that do not fall under their designated Area of Excellence. 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 as a part of additional contributions to the academic enterprise. Clinical expertise is reviewed only for faculty who provide clinical services.

F.1 Change in Rank Form

All executive committee member, department chair, APT committee member, and 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. Faculty members may not vote on any matters affecting promotion from their own rank or higher ranks. 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 internal/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 other contributions to the academic enterprise, 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, 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
 - UT Austin Account Number
 - 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, under contract, etc.
 - 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 professional-track faculty that have designated Clinical Expertise as their area of excellence. 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 professionals 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.
- For professional-track faculty in the Professor title series: Discuss evidence of relevant geographical reputation for the professional-track Professor title series.
- 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

Professional-track candidates must include activities for the previous three years. 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 professional-track faculty that have designated Educational

Leadership as their area of excellence. 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 professionals 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.
- For professional-track faculty in the Professor title series: Discuss evidence of relevant geographical reputation for the professional-track Professor title series.
- 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

Professional-track candidates must include activities for the previous three years. 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 professional-track faculty that have designated Investigation and Inquiry as their area of excellence. 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 professionals 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.
- For professional-track faculty in the Professor title series: Discuss evidence of relevant geographical reputation for the professional-track Professor title series.

- 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. 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 Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise

This section includes the supporting documentation required to demonstrate a record of and evidence supporting a future trajectory of excellence in terms of active, additional contributions to the academic enterprise.

Activities in the area of Academic and Professional Service that faculty are engaged in that do not fall within their designated Area of Excellence must be included as a part of additional contributions to the academic enterprise.

For faculty engaged in clinical care who do not have Clinical Expertise as their designated Area of Excellence, their clinical activities must be included as a part of additional contributions to the academic enterprise.

Additional contributions to the academic enterprise offered by the candidate cannot repeat use of accomplishments and performance in the Area of Excellence.

F.11.1 Executive Committee Statement

The executive committee must provide a statement assessing the quality of the candidate's additional performance, contributions, impact and trajectory with respect to additional contributions to the academic enterprise (in Clinical Expertise, Educational Leadership, Investigation and Inquiry and Academic and Professional Service) that includes both the signatures and typed names of all executive committee members. The statement should:

- Discuss the candidate's contributions in clinical expertise (required for faculty engaged in clinical care who do not have clinical expertise as their designated area of excellence.)
- Discuss the candidate's contributions in the area of academic and professional service that are not included in the designated area of excellence (required for all faculty)
- Discuss the candidate's contributions in educational leadership, if applicable.
- Discuss the candidate's contributions in investigation and inquiry, if applicable.
- For professional-track faculty in the Professor title series: Discuss evidence of relevant geographical reputation for the professional-track Professor title series.

F.11.2 Candidate Statement on Additional Contributions

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 active, additional contributions to the academic enterprise. The statement should discuss, as applicable, 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 should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank. Additional contributions offered by the candidate cannot repeat use of accomplishments and performance in the area of excellence.

F.11.3. Summaries of Additional Contributions

- All candidates must prepare a summary of academic and professional service activity document.
- Faculty who engage in clinical care who do not have Clinical Expertise as their designated Area of Excellence must prepare a summary of clinical activities document. .
- Faculty who engage in teaching who do not have Educational Leadership as their designated Area of Excellence must prepare a summary of instructional activities document.
- Faculty who engage in research who do not have Investigation and Inquiry as their designated Area of Excellence may prepare a List of Five Most Significant Works Completed in Rank using the [University template](#).
- It is important to include annotated descriptions of each activity and candidate's role in the activity. Examples of such summary of activities for each area above can be found on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs website.

F.12 Review Letters

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

- Professional-track Professor title series: At least 2 of the 3 letters must be external and arms' length. One letter may be internal.
- Professional-track Clinical Professor title series: All 3 letters may be internal.

All contributions and accomplishments of these candidates should be evaluated where applicable, but special emphasis should be given to the area of excellence and additional contributions to the academic enterprise.

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;
- For External Reviewers: Name of institution (including the department) with which the reviewer is affiliated;
- For Internal Reviewers: Name of institution (include the department) with which the reviewer is affiliated.
- Brief statement about why the individual was selected; For External Reviewers: 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 professional-track faculty that have selected Investigation and Inquiry as Area of Excellence and professional-track faculty that have opted to include this list for Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise. 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.

PDFs of 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 professional-track faculty that have designated Educational Leadership as their area of excellence. 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. Each dean will attend a promotion review meeting with the president's review committee to discuss their 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 deans 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 [2025 Date TBD].

G.3 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.4 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.5 Resources

- For assistance with the General Guidelines or the promotion and tenure process generally: Office of Faculty Academic Affairs at: dellmedfacultyaffairs@austin.utexas.edu
- 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.6 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 – Professional-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
04a,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.
05_CV.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated CV using Dell Med CV template
06_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.) 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>
07_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

08_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: The candidate 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
09_Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Committee Statement with typed names of and signatures of all committee members. • Candidate Statement that describes active, additional contributions (4 pages or less. Does not have to be signed.) • Summary of Academic and Professional Service Activities (required for all faculty). Activities in the area of Academic and Professional Service that faculty are engaged in that do not fall within their designated Area of Excellence must be included as a part of additional contributions to the academic enterprise. • Summary of Clinical Activities (required for faculty engaged in clinical care who do not have Clinical Expertise as their designated Area of Excellence, their clinical activities must be included as a part of additional contributions to the academic enterprise.) • Summary of Instructional Activities (if applicable) • Five Most Significant Works Completed in Rank (if applicable): The candidate may 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_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>
11a,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>internal/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 internal/external reviewer.
12_Declinations.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All declinations correspondence placed in alphabetical order by last name (if received). CV is not required.
13_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 professional-track faculty that have selected Investigation and Inquiry as Area of Excellence and professional-track faculty that have opted to include this list for Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise. 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 professional-track faculty that have selected Educational Leadership as Area of Excellence.
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.