Emeritus Application Guidelines  
The University of Texas at San Antonio

This set of guidelines provides information for faculty applicants for emeritus, and for departmental faculty review advisory committees (DFRACs), department chairs, and deans involved in the review process. These guidelines are reviewed annually and updated as needed by the Provost’s Office.

The process of emeritus faculty review is undertaken by the university each year. Emeritus status represents an honorary designation, a mechanism by which a faculty member can maintain an official status with the university after separation of employment, and a means for continuing scholarly activities post-retirement. The review of candidates for faculty emeritus status will focus on the career achievements of the applicant. For those candidates intending to remain active scholars as emeritus faculty, it is also appropriate to share any plans for continued scholarly work as part of the submission letter in the review packet.

It is incumbent upon all who are involved in the review process to read all applicable materials, deliberate the strengths and weaknesses of each case in good faith with objectivity, and to observe confidentiality concerning the views of others, as revealed during review discussions. A respectful, thorough, and objective review of faculty accomplishments depends upon the conscientious efforts of all participants in the review process.

UTSA’s process is intended to be as transparent as possible, and all written materials generated through the review process are available for the inspection of faculty candidates. Questions concerning the university’s procedures for emeritus applications may be directed to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

These guidelines are divided into several sections with the following contents:

- **Overview of Process**— a brief description of the timeline for review and the responsibilities of each party at each stage of the process.

- **Preparation of the Review Packet**— a listing of essential elements to include in the emeritus review packet prepared by faculty applicants.

- **Criteria for Emeritus**— information about the criteria to be followed in reviewing emeritus applications.

- **Review Process**— an outline of the responsibilities of the FRAC, department chair, and dean in carrying out the review.

- **Cover Sheet and Checklist**— a summary of required materials to be submitted for emeritus consideration.
**Overview of Process**

The purpose of the emeritus review process is to perform an objective evaluation of each case at several levels of review. Each application goes through at least five levels of independent review before a final recommendation is achieved: DFRAC, chair, dean, provost, and president. The president’s recommendation in all cases is final, but is subject to approval by the UT System Board of Regents.

The emeritus review process is summarized in the table below which outlines the rough timeline and actions of the procedure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall/Winter</td>
<td>Applicant*</td>
<td>Indicate the date, or anticipated date, of retirement from university in writing to chair and dean. Complete form “Request for Review for Emeritus” and return to chair; Begin assembling materials for application packet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean’s Office</td>
<td>Notify Provost’s Office of faculty who wish to be considered for emeritus (send completed form “Request for Review for Emeritus” to the Provost’s Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Provide DFRAC member names to the college and the Provost’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 20</td>
<td>Applicant*</td>
<td>Deadline to submit letter to DFRAC via department chair requesting to be reviewed for emeritus status; Include current vita and completed coversheet and checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Deadline to upload applicant’s documents to Sharepoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>DFRAC (full professors only)</td>
<td>Review application packet; Deliberate in closed meeting and vote on case; Prepare a written summary of evaluation analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Review all application materials, including DFRAC recommendation; Prepare a written recommendation for forwarding to college; Upload DFRAC memo and dept. chair memo to the official Faculty Review folder in Sharepoint and forward manila folder with hard copies of applicant’s materials, DFRAC memo and dept. chair memo to the dean’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>College Dean</td>
<td>Review application packet and department recommendations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare a written recommendation for forwarding to provost;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upload DFRAC, dept. chair and dean’s memos to the official Faculty Review folder in Sharepoint;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>forward manila folder with hard copies of the applicant’s materials, DFRAC, dept. chair and dean’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>memos to the Provost’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Application materials</strong></td>
<td>due in Provost Office by the April 15th, or the first work day thereafter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Review all application materials, including recommendations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consult with chairs and deans, as needed, for clarification of application materials;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare recommendations for the president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April/May</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Review all application materials, including recommendations at each level;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Render final decisions concerning emeritus recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Prepare written notification to all applicants concerning outcome of emeritus review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Forward positive recommendations to UT System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>UT Board of Regents</td>
<td>Approve emeritus recommendations from all campuses in UT System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Prepare written notification to applicants concerning outcome of Board of Regents review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Any tenured faculty member, or group in the department or college, may nominate a qualified tenured UTSA faculty who is retired or anticipates retiring by the end of the academic year. In this case the nominator is responsible for writing the letter to the department chair.
**Preparation of the Application Packet**

The application packet contains the materials that form the basis for the review at all levels of evaluation. It is important that faculty members under consideration for emeritus status make every effort to ensure that the material contained in the packet is complete, accurate, and professionally presented.

The contents of an application packet should include the following elements:

1. Cover sheet and checklist
2. A letter to the DFRAC/department chair
3. A current professional vitae
4. Memos outlining evaluations and recommendations at various levels of review

The letter to the DFRAC/department chair should serve as the basis for outlining the candidate’s qualifications for emeritus status. If the candidate plans to continue pursuing scholarly activities as an emeritus faculty member, a brief outline of those plans should be included in the letter. The professional vitae should serve as a simple listing of professional activities. The candidate is responsible for preparing items #1 – 3; and the departmental faculty review advisory committee, chair, and dean are responsible for appending materials contained in #4. Items #1 – 3 constitute the review materials utilized by the DFRAC, the chair, the dean, the provost, and the president in reviewing the application.

One hard copy of the required materials (#1 – 3,) should be made available in a secured location in the department office and a non-printable electronic copy of #1 -3 should be posted in the official Faculty Review folder in Sharepoint for review by DFRAC members. Item #4 should be added to the hard copy folder and uploaded to Sharepoint when they are completed. Each of these items is described more fully in the following sections.

**1. Cover Sheet**

The cover sheet form is available on this web site as a PDF document, and should be filled in by the faculty candidate and provided with the other materials. The second page of the cover sheet is a checklist of the essential contents of the application package.

**2. Letter to DFRAC/Department Chair**

The letter to the DFRAC/department chair should be organized in three sections, outlining the applicant’s professional activities and experiences. In cases in which the applicant has plans to continue professional activities, the letter should describe any future plans in the areas of teaching, research/scholarly/creative activities, and/or service as applicable. The letter should be no more than 3 - 5 pages long.
3. Professional Vitae

**Name and Contact Information**
This should include UTSA address, if still employed, home address, phone number, email address, as well as current academic rank and date of retirement.

**Educational Background**
List all institutions from which a degree was earned, including the degree received and the major field of study. Awards received while a student at an educational institution may also be listed here.

**Professional Employment History**
List all positions held in sequential order, with applicable dates, since earning the terminal degree, including the present position at UTSA.

**Awards and Honors**
List any awards, honors, prizes, competitions, or other recognition received related to professional activities.

**Research/Scholarly/Creative Activities Summary**
Summarize all products of research/scholarly/creative activities, including publications, exhibitions, performances, architectural projects, reviews, or other documentation of scholarly contributions. List separately the different types of publications (e.g. journal articles, books, reviews, etc.), scholarly products, or creative activity outcomes, providing respective listings of invited contributions, refereed contributions, and non-refereed contributions. All contributions should include the date and title of publication/exhibition/performance, the venue, and where applicable, the inclusive page numbers or size of the scholarly contribution.

**Scholarly Presentations**
List all external oral or poster presentations at conferences, meetings, or other institutions/universities related to scholarly work, and provide the dates and locations of presentations. Use separate listings for invited presentations, refereed contributions, and non-refereed contributions.

**Granting Activities**
Provide a list of grants received, whether for research, instructional, or public service activities (indicate one of these for each grant), giving the name of the granting agency, the project dates, the project title, and the total amount awarded for each.

**Intellectual Property**
Where applicable, provide a summary of any intellectual property generated and indicate any patent applications, copyright privileges, licensing, or other commercialization
that has resulted. The summary should include dates, titles, and other suitable identifying information.

Teaching Activities
List all formal courses taught, indicating the level of the course (undergraduate or graduate) and its title. Provide a list of students mentored in research/scholarly/creative activities and any theses or dissertations directed. Summarize any service on graduate committees and for student advising.

Service Activities
Provide separate listings of important university service activities, including committee assignments and assigned administrative activities (for example, department chairmanship, center directorship, etc.), as well as professional service activities (including leadership in disciplinary organizations, service as a journal editor, manuscript or grant proposal reviewer, meetings or symposia organized, etc.). Additional professional activities (e.g., consulting, etc.) may be included in this section as applicable. Each activity should ideally include the dates of participation, the organizational level of the activity (for example, department, college, etc.), and any leadership roles played.

4. Evaluation and Recommendation Materials
As the application goes through the review process, each level of review should append its analysis and recommendation to the packet for consideration by the next level of review. Guidelines for these various levels of review are provided in the “Review Process” section of these guidelines. The materials should be arranged in the following order, with the responsibility and timing for appending each set of materials indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item to be added to file</th>
<th>Responsible Individual</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFRAC analysis</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Upon completion of department-level review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair’s recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s recommendation</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Upon completion of college-level review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria for Emeritus Review
For general guidelines to the criteria expected for successfulemeritus, please see the UTSA Handbook of Operating Procedures, 2.03 “Emeritus Academic Titles.” Specific criteria will vary by discipline and will be left to individual departments and colleges to enunciate.
Only candidates that receive consistent support at the departmental and college levels of the review process have a strong likelihood of a successful outcome in an emeritus application. Emeritus status is earned through the applicant’s demonstrated contributions that have impacted the university in a positive manner.

**Emeritus Criteria**

A simple enunciation of the criteria to be used for emeritus applications is difficult. As UTSA strives for national research university status, it will be increasingly important that faculty demonstrate academic leadership in their disciplines through their research/scholarly/creative activities. However, sole adherence to this criterion would oversimplify our consideration of the variety of cases that come forward.

For successful emeritus applications, faculty should demonstrate the following qualities:

- They are/have been active scholars whose scholarship manifests an inherent desire to learn about the world and the human condition within it.
- They are/have been devoted and effective teachers who promote student success, both inside and outside the classroom and laboratory.
- They are/have been committed citizens of the university and of their respective disciplines, and manifest this through significant service activities, including leadership positions.
- They have made extraordinary contributions to the university and/or their academic discipline.
- They have been a full-time faculty member in good standing at UTSA for an extended period (for clarification, “an extended period” will generally be interpreted as at least 10 calendar years, but the DFRAC, chair, and/or dean may recommend exceptions to this rule, if requested).

There is significant latitude for departments and colleges to interpret these criteria for emeritus review liberally and to subject them to their own disciplinary lens and filter. It is the intention of the university to utilize emeritus titles to recognize faculty who have made, and continue to make, major contributions to the mission of the university, and by extension, to the national community of faculty in their respective disciplines.

**Review Process**

The review process for emeritus applications involves five levels of review, including the departmental faculty review advisory committee (DFRAC), the department chair, the dean, the provost, and the president. This structure promotes a thorough, objective review of each case, and
provides for input from all relevant perspectives, from the departmental through university-wide viewpoints.

**Roles of Review Entities**

All reports from the various levels are ultimately advisory to the president, who makes final decisions concerning the university’s recommendations for emeritus status. The role of each entity in this review hierarchy can be summarized as follows:

**DFRAC**— a full and detailed review of the candidate’s application for emeritus status. The members of the DFRAC provide a peer review by those members of the university community best qualified to judge the quality of the candidate’s activities. All votes should be by secret ballot so that the votes of individuals are not divulged. Only full professors on the DFRAC may review and vote on the candidate’s application. **Note:** Only DFRAC members physically present for the discussion should participate in the vote of the committee. Voting by proxy, absentee, or email is not permitted.

The DFRAC report should be signed by all participating members of the review committee. On the signature page, the report should include a header that reads: “We, the undersigned members of the DFRAC, have reviewed this report for completeness and accuracy and attest that we have reached our recommendations through a thorough review and discussion of the available documentary evidence.”

**Department Chair**— a full and detailed review of the candidate’s application for emeritus status. The chair should independently evaluate the candidate’s application packet, but consider the recommendations of the DFRAC in arriving at a recommendation.

**Dean**— an independent, comprehensive review of the candidate’s packet, taking the DFRAC and chair’s, recommendations into consideration.

**Provost**— an independent review of the candidate’s packet, and general analysis of the earlier reviews (DFRAC, chair, dean). The provost is responsible for maintaining equivalent, and high, standards across the university. The provost shall then convey her/his recommendations to the president.

**President**— an independent review of the candidate’s packet, and general analysis of the earlier reviews (DFRAC, chair, dean, provost). The president may consult with the provost and other entities prior to reaching a final decision as to the institutional recommendation. Upon reaching a final decision in all cases, the president shall instruct the provost to prepare appropriate written notification to all candidates for emeritus status concerning the outcome of the university’s review process.