

Table of Contents

Section A: Overview.....	3
A.1 Introduction	3
A.2 Professional-Track Title Series	3
A.3 Triannual Review Process.....	4
A.4 Designation as a Promotion Candidate.....	4
A.5 Progression of Promotion Cases through Levels of Review.....	4
A.6 Levels of Review	4
A.7 Eligibility to Vote on a Promotion Review Committee	4
A.8 Minimum Number of Eligible Voting Members for Promotion Review Committees	5
A.9 Managing Joint Appointments	5
A.10 Effective Years in Rank.....	6
A.11 Minimum Amount of Qualifying Service at UT Austin.....	6
A.12 Electing to Combine Service at UT Austin with Time Worked at Prior Institution(s)	6
A.13 Accelerated Review.....	7
A.14 Invoking the Right of Consideration to be a Candidate for Promotion Review.....	7
A.15 Impact of Professional Disruptions	7
A.16 Possible Outcomes Following Considerations for Promotion.....	8
Section B: Areas of Excellence.....	8
B.1 Clinical Expertise	8
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.....	10

E.1	Department Chair and Dean Responsibilities	10
E.2	Candidate Responsibilities	14
E.3	APT Committee Obligations	15
E.4	University Obligations	15
Section F: Dossier Assembly.....		16
F.1	Promotion Review and Voting Sheet	16
F.2	Dean’s Statement (only applicable for Professor title series dossiers).....	16
F.3	Department Chair’s Statement	16
F.4	Joint Department Chair Statement (if applicable)	17
F.5	CV	17
F.6	Candidate Impact Statement	17
F.7	Review Letters.....	19
F.8	Summary of Reviewers.....	19
F.9	Letters Received	20
F.10	Additional Statements.....	20
F.11	Supplemental Materials	20
Section G: Outcomes		22
G.1	President Conferences	22
G.2	Announcement of Decisions	22
G.3	Request for Review by the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom & Responsibility (CCAFR)	22
G.4	Grievances	23
G.5	Resources	23
G.6	HOP, Regents’ Rules, State and Federal Law	23
Section H: Appendix		24
H.1	Summary of Dossier Preparation – Professional-Track Faculty	24

Section A: Overview

A.1 Introduction

As part of The University of Texas Medical Center and working together with our community, the Dell Medical School sets the standard for excellence in integrated, multidisciplinary patient care, pioneering research with meaningful impact, leading innovation in medical education, and catalyzing life sciences entrepreneurship. The Dell Medical School expects all professional-track faculty to be active scholars with vital contributions in their respective areas of contribution which may include research, education, and/or clinical practice.

Faculty will align with the Dell Medical School mission to define the future of health by demonstrating commitment to:

- Building a sustainable academic health system that delivers person-centered, integrated care across the continuum.
- Embracing novel, collaborative solutions to ensure that everyone has a fair and just opportunity to be as healthy as possible.
- Empowering patients, families and communities to be active participants in the health care process through information, access, engagement and agency.
- Cultivating transformative research, entrepreneurship and innovation that leads to real-world impact.
- Equipping faculty, staff and learners with the knowledge and skills necessary to lead the next generation of health care.
- Leading the advancement and use of cutting-edge technologies, data and digital capabilities that serve the needs of patients, physicians, health care professionals, faculty, staff, learners and our community.

The following 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 2025-26 Professional-Track Promotion Policy on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs webpage. 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.

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. Professor Title Series

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor

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. Clinical Professor Title Series

Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor

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 Triannual Review Process

Promotion review for professional-track faculty of the Dell Medical School follows a triannual review process wherein there are three separate “review cycles” in which the faculty may be reviewed. Review during a cycle begins with initiation of request for promotion and proceeds with formal review through all levels at the University. For detailed information on the scheduled triannual review cycles for the academic year, please see the Faculty Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure page on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs webpage.

A.4 Designation as a Promotion Candidate

A faculty member is officially a candidate for promotion once external or internal reviews for promotion have been solicited. At that point, all promotion candidates have the right for their promotion case to progress through all levels of review at the University and only the candidate may withdraw a case before consideration by the president’s committee.

A.5 Progression of Promotion Cases through Levels of Review

Promotion review cases for professional-track faculty progress through all levels of review unless the candidate:

- withdraws the case prior to review by the president,
- resigns from the University, or
- is terminated by the University for disciplinary reasons in accordance with [Regents’ Rule 31008](#).

A.6 Levels of Review

Professional-track faculty are evaluated at multiple independent levels dependent upon their title series:

- Candidates in the Professor title series are evaluated by: (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.
- Candidates in the Clinical Professor title series are evaluated by: (1) department chair, (2) APT Committee, (3) dean, and (4) provost (or designee). The president of The University of Texas at Austin makes the final decision on promotions for all professional-track candidates.

A.7 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:

- A faculty member with a potential or real conflict of interest related to the candidate is ineligible from voting and must recuse themselves from the review, discussion, and vote on that candidate.
- 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 and may not vote at both the executive committee and APT Committee levels.
- Review committee members may not vote if they did not attend the committee meeting (approved remote attendance allowed).

A.8 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, but should not be faculty members from the APT Committee. 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.

Wherever these Guidelines refer to the roles and responsibilities of the executive committee or APT Committee, the statement also holds true for ad hoc promotion review committees as described in this section.

A.9 Managing Joint Appointments

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.

For faculty with joint appointments with another college and/or school at the University, the timing of the review will follow the timeline of the other college or school, regardless of whether Dell Medical School or the other college/school is where the primary appointment resides. Therefore, faculty jointly appointed at another college or school at the University could be reviewed earlier than the typical Dell Medical School schedule and still be considered an on-time promotion. See the [UT Austin General Guidelines for Promotion Review of Professional-Track Faculty](#) for guidance.

The remainder of this section applies to faculty holding a joint appointment between departments within the Dell Medical School. Information for faculty who hold joint appointments between the Dell Medical School and another college or school can be found in the [UT Austin General Guidelines for Promotion Review of Professional-Track Faculty](#).

(a) Joint Appointment within the Dell Medical School of Less Than 30%

Faculty members holding one or more joint appointments of less than 30% are reviewed only in the department corresponding to the primary appointment. The primary department will conduct one review of the candidate at all levels. The joint department will not conduct a formal review of the candidate's materials nor vote on whether or not to promote the candidate.

The department chair or faculty member will request a letter from the joint appointment(s) department chair evaluating the faculty member's contributions to the joint department(s). The following may also be requested from the department(s) corresponding to the joint appointment(s): (a) input regarding selection of reviewers, (b) participation by eligible faculty in writing the required executive committee statements (if

applicable), and (c) optional contributions that may be added to the supplemental materials section of the dossier.

(b) Joint Appointment within the Dell Medical School of at Least 30%

Faculty members in the Professor title series holding a joint appointment of at least 30% must be reviewed by an ad hoc committee with membership corresponding to both the primary and joint appointments. (Faculty members in the Clinical Professor title series are not reviewed at the executive committee/ad hoc committee level.)

Regardless of the title series, the department chair will conduct an independent review of the candidate's dossier.

The department chair corresponding to the candidate's primary appointment is responsible for coordinating with the department chair corresponding to the candidate's joint appointment for the development of the dossier, including: (1) selection and solicitation of reviewers, and (2) if applicable, selection of the ad hoc committee charged with reviewing the dossier, writing the required executive committee statement for each area of review, and voting on their recommendation regarding promotion of the candidate. Note that the faculty members on the ad hoc committee assigned to write each of the executive committee statements must meet eligibility requirements and represent both the primary and joint departments.

A.10 Effective Years in Rank

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. Promotion effective dates for professional-track faculty are dependent upon the cycle in which the candidate is reviewed.

Professional-track faculty accrue one effective year in rank 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. For more guidance on personal circumstances flags, please see the Resource Library for Faculty on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs webpage.

If a professional-track faculty member is laterally reclassified from one professional-track 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.11 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.

A.12 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 minimum required effective years in rank at UT Austin.

The candidate must inform (by email) their department chair and the Dell Medical School Office of Faculty Academic Affairs that they have elected to be considered under the combined service option. The Dell Medical School 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.13 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.14 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.
- b. The case shall be reviewed for promotion at all levels, including the president unless the candidate (1) withdraws the case prior to review by the president's committee, (2) resigns from the University, or (3) is terminated by the University for disciplinary reasons in accordance with [Regents' Rule 31008](#) and [UT Systemwide Policy \(UTS\) 198](#).
- c. Should the professional-track faculty candidate withdraw their dossier from consideration after the executive committee review or 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 review cycle 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 following 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.

A.15 Impact of Professional Disruptions

The University recognizes that there may be various external disruptions originating outside of the control

of the University and UT System that can introduce professional challenges to the work and contributions of our faculty. For example, the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the work of many faculty members beginning in spring 2020 and extending through spring 2022. Candidates may discuss the direct impact of professional disruptions (e.g., lab closures, global supply chain disruptions, inability to travel for work, delayed funding, delayed lab construction, slowed book presses, etc.) on their professional work and opportunities, as well as the overall impact on their productivity, performance, and trajectory using an optional Impact of Professional Disruptions Statement [[please see the Guidelines for the Impact of Professional Disruptions Statement](#)].

Note that inclusion of an Impact of Professional Disruptions Statement does not exclude the associated period from the review. Executive committee and Dell Med APT Committee reviewers as well as the candidate's department chair/designee and dean must determine the extent to which the disruption impacted the faculty member's performance and trajectory. And the reviewers must use the relevant information to contextualize the candidate's record in rank and consider relevant disruptions and resulting impacts when reviewing faculty accomplishments in rank.

Note: While the COVID-19 pandemic and other disruptions might also have introduced personal challenges for many faculty members, those impacts are addressed by the faculty member designating periods during which their productivity was negatively impacted because of personal circumstances, and those designated periods are excluded from the review. Professional-track faculty members had the option of requesting a personal circumstances flag due to the impact of COVID-19. All candidates are evaluated based on the number of effective years of service in rank, not the total time in rank.

A.16 Possible Outcomes Following Considerations for Promotion

Upon consideration for promotion the relevant reviewers and review committees shall recommend that the candidate:

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

The president of The University of Texas at Austin makes the final decision on promotions for all professional-track candidates.

Section B: Areas of Excellence

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. Professional-track faculty designate an eligible Area of Review as their Area of Excellence. Their designated Area of Excellence must be evaluated and a strong record of accomplishments must be demonstrated in 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 excellent health care, building a sustainable academic health system that delivers person-centered, integrated care across the continuum, with a focus on quality, health equity, population and/or public health, value and/or innovation.

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 equip learners with the knowledge and skills necessary to lead the next generation of healthcare.

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 cultivate transformative research, entrepreneurship and innovation that leads to real-world impact.

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 Review.

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. 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.

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 learner 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. 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.

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 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 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.

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

The department, while working with the candidate, is responsible for developing a list of a minimum of 6 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 Summary of Reviewers:

- Reviewers must hold an active academic appointment and be at a higher rank than the candidate and knowledgeable about expectations for promotion in the relevant title series. Faculty that hold Emeritus appointments should generally not be listed as a reviewer.
- Internal reviewers need not be at arm's length. Internal reviewers are expected to be sufficiently independent without a direct, vested interest (i.e. absence of personal relationship, direct mentoring responsibilities).
- Internal reviewers can be faculty members from the candidate's department who are well-qualified scientists, scholars, educators, and clinicians capable of providing a fair and objective evaluation of the candidate's work without perceived bias or personal or professional conflict of interest.
- 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.
- 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 Summary of Reviewers:

- Reviewers must hold an active academic appointment and be at a higher rank than the candidate and knowledgeable about expectations for promotion in the relevant title series. Faculty that hold Emeritus appointments should generally not be listed as a reviewer. Seek out credible reviewers knowledgeable about the scholarly expectations of a peer research university.
- Avoid reviewers who are not at arms' length. Reviewers must not be current or recent close collaborators (within the past seven years), e.g., former supervisors, advisors, mentors, dissertation chairs, postdoctoral mentors, co-investigators, or collaborators. Arm's length reviewers refer to those who are sufficiently distant from the candidate and are capable of objectively assessing the candidate's merit for promotion without bias or personal or professional conflict of interest. However, the department chair and/or dean (or designee) have some latitude to select external reviewer(s) with whom the candidate had a minor collaboration as co-authors or co-investigators.
- Use recognized experts at peer institutions.
- Best practice is that all selected external reviewers would be from different 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 Summary of Reviewers.

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 3 names, while also compiling a list of 3 names of their own. The final list should include a minimum of 6 names. It is encouraged to list more than 6 names in order to ensure that the minimum of 3 letters are returned. 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 reviewers before the solicitation letter is sent. A faculty member is officially a candidate for promotion once external or internal letters 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 the Candidate Impact Statement (section F.6). 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 their reviewers:

- 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.)

Letters may be solicited from collaborators, but these letters do not count toward the minimum number of letters required from reviewers and should not appear within the main dossier's set of reviewer letters.

f. Conflict of Interest:

Any faculty member, department chair, or dean involved in the promotion review (Section A.7) 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 Provost's 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.7.). 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.7.). 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 APT 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.

j. List of Internal Review Committee Members

The dean (or designee) must compile a list of all members of the internal review committees at the department, school and University levels and provide the candidate at least two business days to identify potential conflicts of interest (section E.1.f). Any actual or potential conflict of interest must be shared with and resolved by the dean (or designee) (section E.1.f) before the promotion review begins.

If the actual or potential conflict of interest involves the dean or a member of the president's review committee, the Faculty Affairs team in the Provost's Office must be engaged in the resolution.

E.2 Candidate 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 3 recommended individuals to provide internal and/or external reviewer letters (as applicable for title series). 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 Promotion Review and Voting Sheet 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. To request access, 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. Updates to the Dossier by the Candidate

The candidate's contributions to the dossier (CV and Candidate Impact Statement) must be finalized before the review by the executive committee. If a candidate wishes to update their CV after promotion review has already started, then they must put the updated CV in the Other Supplemental Materials folder. The CV must be dated, and updates must be highlighted. The president's committee may request an update from the candidate as part of its review of the dossier.

c. Information Included in the Dossier by Reference

All accomplishments listed in the CV (e.g., papers, books, research grants, etc.) are 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, course evaluation survey results, dashboards distributed by Data to Insights, etc.) may be considered by the reviewers at any level.

d. Additions to Dossier

If information is added to the promotion dossier after the candidate reviews the dossier in response to questions from the executive committee, department chair, APT Committee, dean, or president's committee, the materials must be placed in the dossier and the date that the materials were added must be indicated.

The department chair/dean (or designee) must inform the candidate that materials were added to the dossier, and the candidate must be given the opportunity to place a statement in the dossier addressing the added materials. All administrative parties who have already reviewed the dossier will also be notified of the inclusion of additional materials. The candidate will not be notified when required statements are added to the dossier after their review, such as the department chair's statement or the dean's statement.

e. 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 (or designee), 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 Promotion Review and Voting Sheet

All executive committee members (as applicable for title series), department chair, APT Committee member, and dean votes and recommendations are recorded on the Promotion Review and Voting Sheet. 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 add the votes and recommendations to the Promotion Review and Voting Sheet.

F.2 Dean's Statement (only applicable for Professor title series dossiers)

The Dean's Statement should limit the amount of information that is duplicated from the Chair's Statement. This statement must be dated and contain the following (in no particular order):

- A summary of the APT Committee's discussion; explanation of the rationale for the committee's vote and resulting recommendation; explanation of negative votes. The dean must solicit feedback from the committee regarding reasons for negative votes (if any) to characterize the overall strength of the APT Committee's recommendations and any areas of concern. The dean's statement must also explain the reason for any eligible Dell Med APT Committee voter's absence.
- Affirmation for accelerated review (if applicable).
- Independent assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in Area of Excellence and Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise with a focus on most recent normative time in rank.
- Explicit contextualization and assessment of the candidate's scholarly trajectory (including citations if applicable) based on their demonstrated productivity, current and future (where relevant).
- Summarize the prestige/quality of the scholarly outlets (e.g. journal, academic press), as applicable for title series.
- Reflect on the reviewers' letters and explain any reservations expressed therein. Describe the relative strength of their overall recommendation (e.g., strongly recommend or recommend). Clearly stated recommended action, which will be recorded on the Promotion Review and Voting Sheet.

F.3 Department Chair's Statement

The Department Chair's Statement must not be longer than four (4) pages in length, must be dated, and contain the following (in no particular order):

- For Professor title series dossiers: A summary of the executive committee's discussion; explanation of the rationale for the committee's vote and resulting recommendation; explanation of negative votes. The department chair must solicit feedback from the committee regarding the reasons for

negative votes (if any) to characterize the overall strength of the committee's recommendations and any areas of concern. The chair's statement must also explain the reason for any eligible Executive Committee voter's absence.

- Description of the standards of excellence in the discipline.
- Explain the timing of the promotion review (e.g., accelerated review, or candidate invoked right of consideration) and provide justification for an accelerated review (section A.13).
- The statement should discuss activities in the Area of Excellence and Additional 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.
- Summarize the prestige/quality of the scholarly outlets (e.g. journal, academic press), as applicable for title series.
- 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.
- Reflect on the letters from internal/external reviewers. Do not quote extensively from the reviewers' letters, but address any concerns raised by the reviewers. If external reviewers identify peers for comparison, provide a high-level comparison of the key metrics for the candidate with those of the peers.
- Describe the relative strength of their overall recommendation (e.g., strongly recommend or recommend). Clearly stated recommended action, which will be recorded on the Promotion Review and Voting Sheet.

F.4 Joint Department Chair Statement (if applicable)

If the faculty member holds a joint appointment of less than 30% or a courtesy appointment in another unit or units, the unit's department chair or dean may provide a statement. The statement must not be more than four (4) pages in length and must be dated.

F.5 CV

The candidate's dossier is to include a curriculum vitae (CV) using the Dell Medical School CV template. The CV template provides instruction on how to include annotations and organize work and accomplishments, so that they are recognized for their merit. The CV template and a CV Review Checklist can be found on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs webpage and used by the candidate to ensure the CV follows the CV template. **Please note: CVs that are not aligned with the CV template may put timeliness of promotion review at risk.**

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

F.6 Candidate Impact Statement

The candidate must provide in four (4) pages or less one Candidate Impact Statement of contributions and achievements in their Area of Excellence and Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise. The statement should discuss activity, impact, and trajectory of scholarship, service/leadership, educational activities, mentorship, and community-facing scholarship and practice. (For professional-track faculty in the Professor title series: Discuss evidence of relevant geographical reputation for the professional-track

Professor title series.) Discuss trajectory – evidence that the impact of activities is increasing over time. 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.

- For Clinical Expertise as an Area of Excellence:
 - 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 Educational Leadership as an Area of Excellence:
 - Discuss educational activity – teaching in the clinic or hospital setting, didactic and/or clinical teaching, learner evaluations, curriculum development, participation in departmental, school, university, or professional society educational activities, awards for teaching.
- For Investigation and Inquiry as an Area of Excellence:
 - The [NIH Relative Citation Ration \(RCR\) index \(mean RCR\)](#) must be included as a link to the faculty member's iCite profile. PDF of iCite link results page for RCR index should be added to the Other Supplemental Materials Folder of the dossier.
 - Discuss 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; 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.
 - Summary of External Research Grants: The Faculty Affairs team in the Provost's Office will distribute a list to the Dell Medical School Office of Faculty Academic Affairs for inclusion in the dossier. The Office of the Vice President for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Endeavors generates the list and includes the candidate's role on each external research grant. Candidates will review their Summary of External Research Grants and provide updates/corrections to the document (if applicable).
- For Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise (applicable for all candidates):
 - 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.
- Discuss scholarship – contributions to the development, dissemination, and translation of health professionals education, knowledge, and practices and the impact and trajectory of this work. 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.
- 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 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.

F.7 Review Letters

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

- Professor title series: At least 2 of the 3 letters must be external and arms' length. One letter may be internal.
- 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.8 Summary of Reviewers

All solicited review letters received concerning a candidate must be included in the candidate's dossier. The department is to prepare a summary of reviewers solicited using the Summary 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 Internal and External Reviewers: Name of institution (including 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.

Note that for any reviewer's letter received after the Executive Committee review:

- The letter should be placed in the Supplemental Materials folder and
- In the Date Letter Received field of the Summary of Reviewers table, an asterisk (*) should be inserted at the end of the received date for the relevant letter.

F.8.1 Correspondence from Declinations

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

F.8.2 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.8.3 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.9 Letters Received

Place the letters received before the vote of the Executive Committee 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 nominated the letter writer. This notation should match the information provided on Summary of Reviewers.

All solicited letters received before the Executive Committee review has begun must be included in the candidate's dossier. Any solicited letter received after the Executive Committee vote will be placed in Supplementary Materials. A short version of the reviewer's CV is to be included behind each letter.

F.10 Additional Statements

Any additional statements, including those required by the college/school but not the University and those added by the candidate after the dossier review has commenced, shall be placed in this section of the dossier. All statements must include the date the information was added to the dossier. Section E.4.d. provides instructions for required notifications when an additional statement is added to the dossier.

F.11 Supplemental Materials

Supplemental materials are all optional (except where noted above) and 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. The candidate should determine, with guidance from their department, if including one or more optional supplemental materials would meaningfully contribute to the dossier and promotion case.

F.11.1 Learner Evaluations

The candidate may 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 materials folder in the following order: medical student evaluations, resident evaluations, and continuing medical education evaluations. Please clearly label each with a header.

F.11.2 Summary of Instructional Activities

Recommended for all professional-track faculty that have designated Educational Leadership as their Area of Excellence. Candidates may 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 webpage.

F.11.3 Selected Instructional Materials

Recommended 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.11.4 Five Most Significant Works

Recommended for all professional-track faculty that have designated Investigation and Inquiry as their Area of Excellence. The candidate may identify the five most significant works completed while in their current rank. The candidate may provide a list of those works using the [University template](#). If significant works were sent to reviewers providing letters of assessment then those are the works that must be included here. For each of the works that is co-authored, the candidate would 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.

PDFs of the five most significant works will be placed in supplemental materials folder, not in the dossier.

F.11.5 Summary of Clinical Activities

Recommended for all professional-track faculty that have designated Clinical Expertise as their Area of Excellence. Candidates may 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 webpage.

F.11.6 Selected Clinical Innovations

Candidates may 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. Provide a table of contents (as cover sheet to this section) with brief annotations of each item listed.

F.11.7 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.11.8 Letters Solicited from Mentees

The department is to prepare a separate Summary of Reviewers for letters solicited from mentees, listed in alphabetical order by last name, using the template provided by the Provost's Office. Letters solicited from mentees must be placed behind the Summary of Reviewers. A CV is not required.

F.11.9 Correspondence from Reviewers Received after the Executive Committee review (if applicable)

Letters from external reviewers that are received after the Executive Committee review has begun must be included in this folder in alphabetical order by last name.

F.11.10 Additional Materials Requested by Secondary Academic Unit (FOLDER)

If applicable (i.e., the candidate holds a joint appointment of at least 30%) this folder should be used to contain materials required by the non-primary joint appointment unit (department, college, school).

F.11.11 Optional Impact of Professional Disruptions Statement

Candidates have the discretion to include an Impact of Professional Disruptions Statement (limited to two pages) in their dossier and the materials may be distributed to reviewers, if applicable. The Statement must adhere to the [Guidelines for the Impact of Professional Disruptions Statement](#).

F.11.12 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 decision. Provide a table of contents (as a coversheet to this section) with brief annotations of each item listed. If a candidate wishes to update their CV after promotion review has already started, then they must put the updated CV in the Other Supplemental Materials folder. The CV must be dated, and updates must be highlighted.

Section G: Outcomes

G.1 President Conferences

The president's review committee will review and discuss the promotion dossiers. Each dean will attend a promotion review meeting with the president's review committee to discuss the work of the candidates from their college/school. In some cases, the president may request additional information to make a decision that is in the best interest of the University (e.g., an update of accomplishments in rank from the candidate, formal assessment of a candidate's contributions and achievements from additional experts in the field, key University stakeholders are invited to address questions that have not been resolved within the dossier or during the conference with the dean, etc.).

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 on specific dates that align with the corresponding triannual review cycle. Please see triannual promotion cycle timelines for professional-track faculty on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs webpage.

G.3 Request for Review by the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom & Responsibility (CAFR)

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 may 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. 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.

For guidance on specific dates for CCAFR requests for review that align with the corresponding triannual review cycle, please see triannual promotion cycle timelines for professional-track faculty on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs webpage.

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](#) (as applicable).

G.5 Resources

- For assistance with the Guidelines or the promotion and tenure process generally: Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost at <https://ut.service-now.com/evpp>
- For assistance specific to the Dell Medical School: 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 pertaining to the candidate.

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_Dean Statement.pdf	Statement from Dean <ul style="list-style-type: none">For Professor title series dossiers only.Office of Faculty Academic Affairs will upload to the dossier.
02_Chair Statement.pdf	Statement from Department Chair of Primary Department
03_Joint Chair Statement.pdf	Statement from the joint Department Chair (if applicable)
04_CV.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Updated CV using Dell Med CV template
05_Candidate Impact Statement.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Candidate Impact Statement (4 pages or less. Does not have to be signed.)For faculty that have designated Investigation and Inquiry as their Area of Excellence: The NIH Relative Citation Ration (RCR) index (mean RCR) must be included in the statement as a link to the faculty member's iCite profile.For faculty that have designated Investigation and Inquiry as their Area of Excellence: Summary of External Research Grants (Office of Faculty Academic Affairs will provide to faculty for review before uploading to the dossier.)
06_Summary of Reviewers.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Grouped by Received, Declined, and No ResponseReviewers listed in alphabetical order by last name within each group. Use the Summary of Reviewers Template.Correspondence from Declinations. All declinations correspondence placed in alphabetical order by last name (if received). CV is not required.Sample of Solicitation Letter/Email

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>
07a, 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 internal/external reviewer. This information must match what is listed on the Summary of Reviewers. Each letter should include CV of internal/external reviewer.

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. All statements must include the date the information was added to the dossier.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS FOLDER

PDF File Name in UT Box	PDF Document Contents
01a, 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.
02_Summary of Instructional Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended for professional-track faculty that have designated Educational Leadership as their Area of Excellence. Candidates may include activities for the previous three years.
03_Selected Instructional Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copy of Teaching Portfolio: selectively chosen examples of instructional or curricular materials. Recommended for professional-track faculty that have selected Educational Leadership as Area of Excellence. Should include a table of contents with very brief description/relevance of items.
04_Five Most Significant Works Completed in Rank (FOLDER) File naming convention: 01_List of five significant works 02_Short_title for first significant work through 06_Short_title for the fifth significant work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PDF describing the five most significant works created using the List of Five Most Significant Works template. Recommended 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 separate PDFs.
05_Summary of Clinical Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended for professional-track faculty that have selected Clinical Expertise as Area of Excellence.
06_Selected Clinical Innovations.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of materials, clinical innovations, or other scholarly works. Should include a table of contents with very brief description/relevance of items.
07_Letters from Collaborators.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chart of collaborators listed in alphabetical order by last name. Can use the Summary of Reviewers Template. All letters placed in alphabetical order by last name after the chart of collaborators. CV is not required.

08_Letters from Mentees.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chart of mentees listed in alphabetical order by last name. • Can use the Summary of Reviewers Template. • All letters placed in alphabetical order by last name after the chart of mentees. CV is not required.
09_Correspondence from Reviewers Received After EC Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewer letters received after EC Review placed 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 internal/external reviewer. This information must match what is listed on the Summary of Reviewers. • Each letter should include CV of internal/external reviewer.
10_Additional Materials Required by Secondary Academic Unit (FOLDER)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If applicable, this folder should be used to contain materials required by the non-primary joint appointment unit (department, college, school).
11_Optional Impact of Professional Disruption Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Optional Impact of Professional Disruption Statement
12_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. • PDF of NIH mean RCR index information. • CV updates, if applicable.