Promotion and Tenure Application Guidelines
The University of Texas at San Antonio

This set of guidelines provides information for faculty applicants for promotion and tenure as prescribed by the Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP), chapter 2.10 “Faculty Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure,” and for faculty review advisory committees (FRACs), 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 promotion and tenure is one of the most important activities undertaken by the university each year as it is one means by which the university upholds high standards and expectations for its faculty. 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 promotion and tenure 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 Promotion Packet**— a listing of essential and optional elements to include in the promotion packet prepared by faculty applicants.

- **Solicitation of External Reviews**— some guidelines for department chairs to use in seeking external review letters.

- **Criteria for Promotion and Tenure**— information about the criteria to be followed in reviewing promotion and tenure applications, including cases for early tenure.

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

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

The purpose of the promotion and tenure process is to perform an objective evaluation of each case at several levels of review. Therefore, each case goes through at least seven levels of independent review before a final recommendation is achieved: DFRAC, chair, CFRAC, dean, UFRAC, 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 promotion and tenure 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>January</td>
<td>Provost &amp; Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Forward forms for early promotion and tenure and promotion to full professor to the colleges and departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1st</td>
<td>Dean’s Office</td>
<td>Deadline to forward requests for early promotion and tenure review and requests for promotion to full professor to the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. – March</td>
<td>Provost &amp; Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Notify deans and department chairs which faculty members are due to undergo a mandatory review in the coming fall semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1st</td>
<td>Provost &amp; Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Notify tenure-track faculty members that their mandatory review will take place in the coming fall semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March – April</td>
<td>Provost &amp; Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Set up electronic boxes and forward links to applicants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Begin assembling materials for application packet; submit names of suggested external reviewers to chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Solicit suggestions of external reviewers from applicant and faculty; Begin contacting potential reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>If the faculty member being reviewed for promotion to full professor is a department chair, the dean shall appoint another faculty member at or above the rank of the department chair to serve in the role of department chair for this process. Provide the name to the Provost’s Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Summer</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Finish assembling application packet and submit to chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Solicit external reviews; letters are due in August; Upload external review letters, a short bio for each reviewer and a copy of the letter sent to the reviewer requesting his/her assistance with the P&amp;T cases no later than September 1st.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upload peer observer’s report(s) and faculty member’s report (s) (provided by each candidate).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Dean’s Office</td>
<td>Provide DFRAC names to the Provost’s Office no later than Sept. 1 or the first workday thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide CFRAC names to the Provost’s Office no later than Sept. 10 or the first workday thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Upload promotion and tenure documents to the official Faculty Review folder in SharePoint no later than Sept. 1st or the first workday thereafter. Also submit one manila folder to department chair with hard copies of your cover sheet, vita, and statement of evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-October</td>
<td>DFRAC</td>
<td>Review application packet and external review letters; 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;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Department Chair | Prepare a written recommendation for forwarding to college;  
|                 | Provide a written notification to applicant of the Department’s recommendations;  
|                 | Upload DFRAC memo and department chair memo to the official Faculty Review folder in SharePoint;  
|                 | Include original signed copies of external review letters, DFRAC memo, and department chair memo in the faculty folder and forward to the Dean’s Office. |

| September - October | Applicant | Optional opportunity to update file by adding new materials before forwarding to the college. |

| September - November | CFRAC | Review application packet, external review letters, peer observer’s report(s), faculty member’s report(s), and department recommendations;  
|                     |       | Deliberate in closed meeting and vote on case;  
|                     |       | Prepare a written summary of evaluation analysis. |

| September - November | College Dean | Review application packet, external review letters, peer observer report(s) faculty member report(s), department recommendations, and CFRAC recommendation;  
|                     |             | Prepare a written recommendation for forwarding to provost;  
|                     |             | Provide a written notification to applicant of the college’s recommendations;  
|                     |             | Upload signed checklist to the official Faculty Review folder in SharePoint;  
|                     |             | Upload CFRAC memo and dean’s memo to the official Faculty Review folder in SharePoint;  
|                     |             | Include original signed copy of checklist, CFRAC memo and dean’s memo to faculty folder and forward to the Provost’s Office. |

| November | College Dean | Application materials due in Provost Office by the November 15th, or the first work day thereafter |

<p>|                     | Applicant | Optional opportunity to update file by adding new materials before forwarding to the Provost Office. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November-December</td>
<td>UFRAC, Provost Office</td>
<td>Review application packet, external review letters, department and college recommendations; Deliberate in closed meetings and vote on cases; Prepare a written recommendation for forwarding the Provost. Include a summary of evaluation analysis of cases for which there has been division of opinion. Upload UFRAC Memo to the official Faculty Review folder in SharePoint; Include original signed copy of the memo to the respective faculty folders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December-January</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Review all application materials, including UFRAC recommendation; Consult with chairs and deans, as needed for clarification of application materials; Prepare recommendations on all cases for the president.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Review all application materials, including recommendations at each level; Render final decisions concerning promotion and tenure recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Prepare written notification to all applicants concerning outcome of promotion and tenure review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Forward positive recommendations to UT System by May 1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>UT Board of Regents</td>
<td>Approve promotion and tenure recommendations from all campuses in UT System.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*External Review letters should be printed on the respective reviewer’s university letterhead with a clear, legible signature. An electronic version is acceptable, provided that it is on university letterhead and contains a clear, legible signature. All external review letters (including electronic versions) should be uploaded to SharePoint and a hard copy should be placed in the faculty member’s review folder. Email letters are not acceptable.*
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 promotion and tenure 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 statement of self-evaluation
3. a professional vitae
4. evaluations and recommendations by the various levels of review
5. documentation of teaching effectiveness
   - summary of course evaluations (complete template)
   - peer observer’s report(s)
   - faculty member’s report(s)
6. documentation of research/scholarly/creative activities
7. summary of service activities and responsibilities
8. optional supplementary materials
9. late materials

The professional vitae should serve as a simple listing of professional activities, while each of the other components provides more in-depth information about those activities. The suggested contents of each of these elements should include, but are not limited, to those suggested below. The candidate is responsible for preparing items #1 – 3 and #5 – 9 above (except that the peer observer’s report(s) and the faculty member’s report(s) is uploaded by the chair); the faculty review advisory committees, chair, dean and provost are responsible for appending materials contained in #4.

Items #1 – 4 constitute the review materials utilized by each of the FRACs, the chair, the dean, the provost, and the president in reviewing the application. Items #5 – 9 are made available to reviewers at the department and college levels, but are not transmitted to the university level unless the UFRAC or the provost should specially request them. The self-evaluation and vitae (#2 – 3) plus the documentation of research/scholarly creative activities (#6) comprise the information sent to external reviews for their evaluation. This information is summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. review</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One hard copy of the required materials (#1 – 3) should be made available in a secured location in the department office and an electronic copy of #1 -3 and #5-9 should be posted in the official Faculty Review folder in SharePoint for review by FRAC 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.

\textbf{1. Cover Sheet}

The cover sheet form is available on the Provost’s website as a PDF document, and should be filled in by the faculty candidate and provided with the other materials. The second and later pages of the cover sheet are a checklist of the essential contents of the application package, as well as a checklist of possible optional supplementary materials that may be submitted by the applicant.

The checklist should be signed by the department chair and dean once they have reviewed the files. All should be actual signatures, not electronic or digital signatures.

\textbf{2. Statement of Self-Evaluation}

The statement of self-evaluation should be organized in three sections, outlining the applicant’s activities, experiences, and plans in the areas of teaching, research/scholarly/creative activities, and service, respectively.

- For the teaching section, the applicant may wish to include a teaching statement outlining her or his philosophy/approach to teaching, and describe any innovative approaches used in delivering instruction.
- In the research/scholarly/creative activity section, the applicant can provide a context for her or his scholarly work, indicating the relationship between different projects and plans for future scholarship and how those plans build on past accomplishments (if applicable).
- The service section should provide an overview of service activities and explain the applicant’s participation in key service roles, including her or his philosophy of service and how it complements teaching and scholarly activities.

The statement of self-evaluation should be no more than 8 – 10 pages long.

\textbf{3. Professional Vitae}

\textbf{Name and Contact Information} This should include UTSA address, phone number, and email address, as well as current academic rank (for example, Assistant Professor or Associate Professor).
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 baccalaureate 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 all committee assignments, assigned administrative activities (for example, department chairmanship, center directorship, etc.), and professional service activities (including leadership in disciplinary organizations, service as a journal editor, manuscript or grant proposal reviewer, meetings or symposia organized, etc.). Each activity should 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

Note: The faculty member under review does not have access to these materials at any point during the review process. These materials can be requested upon completion of the review.

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</th>
<th>Responsible Individual</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External review letters</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Prior to DFRAC review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Observer’s Report(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member’s Report (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFRAC analysis</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Upon completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair’s recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upon completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFRAC analysis</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Upon completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upon completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFRAC analysis*</td>
<td>UFRAC Chair</td>
<td>Upon completion of UFRAC review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only required if UFRAC conclusion differs from earlier recommendations, or there is disparity among the earlier reviews.
5. Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness

Listing of Courses with Teaching Evaluation Summaries

Provide a table of courses taught during the evaluation period (the probationary period for tenure-track faculty, the period since the last promotion, or last post-tenure review, for tenured faculty), using the template provided below (this template may be down-loaded from the website). Do not include copies of student evaluation surveys or comments among these materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>New prep?</th>
<th>Course Enrollment</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Course rating</th>
<th>Instructor rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP2011</td>
<td>ABC nnn3</td>
<td>LD, UD, or GR</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>yyy</td>
<td>X.X</td>
<td>Y.Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: LD = lower division, UD = upper division, GR = graduate-level

Peer Observer’s Report

Please refer to the Peer Observation Guidelines and the HOP, Chapter 2.20 “Peer Observation of Teaching” for more information. Provide the report to the department chair according to the Peer Observation Guidelines, but no later than Sept. 1st, or the first workday thereafter, so that the department chair may upload it to the official Faculty Review folder in SharePoint.

Faculty Member’s Report

Please refer to the Peer Observation Guidelines and the HOP policy, Chapter 2.20 “Peer Observation of Teaching” for more information. Provide the report to the department chair according to the Peer Observation Guidelines, but no later than Sept. 1st, or the first workday thereafter, so that the department chair may upload it to the official Faculty Review folder in SharePoint.

Teaching Portfolios

For each course taught, provide a portfolio containing the course syllabus, exams, handouts, problem sets and other written assignments, and other course materials developed by the faculty candidate.

Instructional Development

List any workshops, seminars, or other related meetings attended (or organized) to increase pedagogical effectiveness. This information should include the dates, formats, locations, and names of organizers.
Instructional Grants
List all grants related to instructional activities. This may be taken directly from relevant grants listed on the professional vitae and should contain the information indicated above for “Grant Activities.” Provide electronic copies of all funded grants and, optionally, referee comments for those grant proposals.

Teaching Awards
List any awards received for excellence in university-level teaching. This may include both awards received at UTSA and at other institutions of higher education, and should indicate the date, award name, awarding unit (for example, college, university, etc.), and institution.

Students Mentored
Provide a list of all students mentored in scholarly activities, indicating those who have completed degree programs under your mentorship, those who are currently enrolled, and employment outcomes for mentored students who have graduated. For undergraduate course advisement, a summary of the number of students served is sufficient.

6. Documentation of Research/Scholarly/Creative Activities

Scholarly Products
Provide an electronic copy of all research/scholarly/creative works produced during the evaluation period. This includes full copies of any journal articles, book chapters, papers in conference proceedings, architectural projects, digital images of artwork, recordings of musical performances or compositions, and other short-format works. These may include manuscripts under review or in preparation. Applicants should provide 3-6 hard copies of any full books authored or edited by the faculty member for use in external review of the application. Portions of books may also be scanned to create a digital image for use in the internal review—scanning services are available through the University Library. In cases where the amount of scholarly products is extensive, a representative sample of scholarly products may be submitted, after consultation with the department chair. Note that citation indices of published work may be included among the optional supplementary materials.

Reviews
Where appropriate, provide copies of any reviews of scholarly and creative activity, including reviews of books published, exhibitions, performances, compositions, architectural projects, and other creative endeavors.
Grant Proposals

An electronic copy of all funded grant proposals, as well as any proposals under review, or in preparation, should be provided with an indication of the present status of the proposal. Referee comments from funded proposals may be submitted along with the proposals themselves. If the amount of funded proposals is extensive, a representative sample of proposals may be submitted, after consultation with the department chair.

Intellectual Property

Provide documentation of any intellectual property produced, including patents, copyrights, licensing agreements or other commercialization activities. Faculty are not required to divulge sensitive information concerning the intellectual property, but may document its development and potential commercialization through letters and other communications.

7. Summary of Service Activities and Responsibilities

Committee Assignments

Separately list committee assignments at the department, college, and university levels, indicating dates of service and the name of the committee chair. Applicants should also indicate the extent of their contributions to the work of each committee listed.

Professional Service Activities

List any activities, other than leadership positions, in the service of professional and disciplinary organizations. These may include committee assignments, manuscript and proposal review, journal editorship, organization of meetings, and other assistive activities. In all cases, provide dates of service, organizations served, and time committed.

Leadership Positions

Provide a summary of any leadership positions held at the university or within a professional/disciplinary organization or society. List the dates for each applicable position, the responsibilities of the position, and the time commitment involved in executing the responsibilities of the position. Also, indicate any special accomplishments achieved while in the leadership position.

8. Optional Supplementary Materials

Applicants for promotion and tenure may submit optional supplementary materials to highlight or document achievement in the areas of teaching, research/scholarly/creative activities, and service
activities. A checklist of possible items that might be included among the supplementary materials is included with the Cover Sheet form available from the Provost’s website. Applicants are asked to provide materials in a non-printable (optional) electronic/digital format uploaded to the official Faculty Review folder in SharePoint, or other secure university-supported web site as may be directed. In addition, each department may determine whether a hard copy of selected supplementary materials should be made available in the department office along with the required materials.

Upon completion of the external review of a case, all professional work products, including copies of publications, reviews, creative works, grant proposals, reviewer comments, and other primary works, will be included among the supplementary materials. Candidates for promotion and tenure may also submit other supplementary materials in support of the application, including full sets of student teaching surveys with comments, works in progress, a statement of future research goals and directions, and other items as allowed by the department and college.

Hard copies of the professional work products and supplementary materials will not automatically be made available for college-level review (the non-printable electronic copies will still be accessible online). The CFRAC and dean may optionally request a hard copy of any of those materials, if needed. Once the college-level review is completed, the supplementary materials will remain posted online during subsequent review of the application.

In extraordinary cases, where the supplementary materials might clarify a point in dispute from earlier reviews, the UFRAC may also request access to hard copies of these materials for a given case. Once the president’s final decision concerning a candidate is made, the secure website containing supplementary materials will ordinarily be emptied and any hard copies of work products returned to the faculty applicant. Digital supplementary materials may be retained by the university in tenure denial cases until all appeals are completed.

Please note that collecting supplementary materials in digital format is the responsibility of the faculty applicant. Assistance in creating digital archives is available through the Office of Information Technology and the University Library. By storing these materials online, the intent is that they are made accessible for the convenience of the DFRAC, department chair, CFRAC, and dean to assist in their separate deliberations.

Special Note to Faculty
These guidelines are intended to help you prepare the most compelling, well-documented case possible for promotion and tenure. With the exception of primary work products (items #5 – 7) which become a part of the supplementary materials, your application packet will be evaluated at all levels of the review. As you prepare your packet, please consider how readily a reader may access and absorb the material it contains. Repetition and verbosity will only serve to fatigue reviewers without adding substance to your packet—be as concise and succinct as possible in each section of the packet.
Solicitation of External Reviews

The purpose of using external reviews as a part of the promotion and tenure process is to advise the university as to the broader impact and value of a faculty member’s research/scholarly/creative productivity to the discipline. At UTSA, external reviews are used to confirm the significance of results arising from the scholarly efforts of a faculty member, but are not intended to be conclusive elements of a promotion and tenure review.

Guidelines for Selecting External Reviewers

- There should be at least three (3), but no more than six (6) external reviewers chosen to evaluate each faculty candidate.

- External reviewers should themselves be experts in the faculty candidate’s sub-field, but should not be a past mentor, or a frequent or current collaborator. Each reviewer should be asked to outline in the report any past association that she or he may have with the faculty candidate.

- Reviewers should ideally hold full professor rank or equivalent. The only exceptions to this should be reviewers who are acknowledged emerging leaders in the field though not yet at the rank of full professor. Reviewers that are not affiliated with an academic institution (for example, a researcher at a national laboratory) should have rank and experience commensurate with that of a full professor.

- Reviewers should be affiliated with a department or institution that is an aspirant for the department of the faculty candidate. One of the chief purposes of promotion and tenure is to ensure that the university is making progress towards its strategic goals and aspirations. This cannot occur unless we continually solicit advice from those who represent aspirant institutions.

- Responsibility for choosing external reviewers rests with the department chair, but should involve consultation with others, including the faculty candidate.

- Each department should develop written guidelines for soliciting suggestions for reviewers and work to ensure the integrity of the process. That process should include:
  - consideration of names suggested by the faculty candidate;
  - elimination of up to two names identified by the faculty candidate as unsuitable due to a real or perceived conflict of interest;
  - consideration of names proposed by senior faculty in the same general area as the faculty candidate; and,
  - construction of a final list of reviewers that includes both names suggested by the faculty candidate, as well as some that are not suggested by the candidate.
Process of Soliciting External Reviews

- During the spring prior to the promotion and tenure review, the department chair should solicit suggestions of potential reviewers from the faculty candidate and senior faculty in the same general sub-field as the candidate, then contact prospective reviewers to ascertain their availability to provide a review.

- If the list of potential reviewers solicited by the department chair is exhausted without yielding at least three reviewers, the Chair should request additional names from both the faculty candidate and the senior faculty in the same general sub-field.

- Once the list of reviewers is finalized, the department chair shall forward the application packet, including relevant work products, to the external reviewers for their evaluation. This should take place early enough to allow the department time to review the case.

- In the cover letter sent by the department chair soliciting the review (a sample template is available separately), the chair shall minimally include the following:
  - the date by which a written review is required by the department;
  - the letter should be printed on the reviewer’s university/college letterhead with a clear, legible signature. An electronic version is acceptable, provided that it is on university letterhead and contains a clear, legible signature. All external review letters (including electronic versions) should be uploaded to SharePoint and a hard copy should be placed in the faculty member’s review folder. Email letters are not acceptable;
  - the information sought by the department to assist in its evaluation and deliberations, and the role of the external review in our process;
  - the transparency of the UTSA promotion and tenure process and the likelihood that the letter will be viewed by others, including the faculty candidate; and,
  - appreciation for their willingness to provide a review.

- In soliciting the review, the Chair should indicate that the reviewer is not obligated to provide any advisory or conclusive statements, or to speculate as to the likely success of the application for promotion and tenure at another institution. Reviewers’ comments should include, but are not necessarily limited to:
  - a description of any past association with the faculty candidate;
  - prior familiarity with the candidate’s scholarly work;
  - identification of the most significant scholarly results produced by the faculty candidate and the impact that those results have had on the discipline;
  - appropriateness of the venues/outlets used by the candidate to disseminate scholarly products; and,
  - any relevant information about common practices within the discipline or sub-field of the candidate related to collaboration, multiple authorship, grant funding, or other characteristics that may help the university evaluate the scholarly output of the faculty candidate fairly and objectively.
• Reviewers may optionally provide information about the impact of any professional (disciplinary) service rendered by the faculty candidate, but should not attempt to evaluate the significance of the candidate’s teaching or local service activities, unless they have had the opportunity to personally observe those activities.

• The Chair should obtain a short vitae or biography for each reviewer for inclusion with the review letter. Such vitae should be no more than two pages in length.

Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

For general guidelines to the criteria expected for successful promotion and tenure, please see the UTSA Handbook of Operating Procedures, 2.10 “Faculty Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.” Specific criteria will vary by discipline and will be left to individual departments and colleges to enunciate. In this section, we provide some thoughts and reflections on how we set criteria in ways that help the university achieve its long-term goals.

Tenure Criteria

The university has expressed an ambitious goal to become a premier or “national” research university in the coming years. Consequently, its decisions concerning the awarding of tenure to young faculty must be made commensurate with this aspiration. At the same time, the university has an important responsibility to provide access to educational excellence for its students. These mutually supportive themes suggest that successful applicants for tenure and promotion to associate professor will have the following attributes:

• They will be active researchers, scholars, and creative artists who engage in discovery and in exploring the nature of the world and the human condition in new ways and with new perspectives.

• They will disseminate their discoveries and creations so that their work has impact that goes beyond the local community. This dissemination can be manifest in several ways, including publication, exhibition, review, performance, and presentation.

• Their work will develop concepts and ideas beyond those explored in their graduate dissertations and theses, indicating their essential independence as active scholars.

• Their instructional activities will be enhanced by their scholarship by:
  o extending knowledge about the “cutting-edge” of academic disciplines;
  o providing multiple perspectives on different fields of knowledge, especially those in which there is controversy or dispute;
  o making available opportunities for all students to engage personally in the act of discovery and creation; and,
  o modeling the excitement of scholarly activity as one means of lifelong learning.

• They will exercise innovative approaches in their instructional activities, including seeking out novel methods of delivery, student engagement, and self-guided learning.
They will take seriously their commitment to develop students into transformative leaders of a diverse society within a global context.

They will demonstrate willingness to engage in service activities that benefit their department, college, and professional discipline.

Without exception, they will measurably improve their departments and colleges and raise the standard for the next generation of tenure-track faculty.

This last point is important as it implicitly states that each department and college must consciously ask the question, “Does this faculty member raise the level of our department by their presence and activity or not?” If the answer is that the candidate does not, then tenure should not be awarded.

Early Tenure

Tenure-track faculty may be considered early for award of tenure and promotion, that is, before the beginning of the sixth year of the probationary period. However, as the university’s standards for tenure rise, it will be increasingly difficult for faculty candidates to achieve “early tenure.” Recent statistics suggest that success with early tenure is only about half as likely as it is for candidates applying in the sixth year.

The following thoughts concern the circumstances under which early tenure and promotion should be considered, or not:

The university’s baseline assumption is that all candidates will not be considered for tenure and promotion until the penultimate (usually sixth) year of the probationary period.

The overall record for scholarly achievement, teaching excellence, and willingness to participate in service obligations for an “early” candidate should be comparable in terms of both quantity and quality to that of a successful candidate coming up in the sixth year.

A candidate who is showing “good progress” toward tenure is not necessarily ready to be tenured and promoted (see previous point).

Departments should include consideration of any scholarly productivity completed prior to coming to UTSA by tenure-track faculty who have served as faculty at other colleges and universities. In essence, all accomplishments by faculty in their current and equivalent positions should be considered. This may lead to a favorable decision to promote early.

Before initiating the process for an early tenure and promotion consideration, tenure-track faculty should consult with the chair and, if possible, the dean. If they cannot provide unqualified support for an early application, it is best to wait before applying.
• A final decision to “hold without prejudice” an early application for tenure is not a rejection or a denial, but simply a statement that the case is not yet ready for approval.

**Unsolicited Advice for Tenure-Track Faculty**

As you set your expectations for what level of accomplishment is needed to achieve tenure and promotion to associate professor, look beyond your own department. Consider the kinds of activities and productivity that are required for tenure at an institution (or department) to which we aspire. Look at what faculty at those institutions typically achieve in order to earn tenure and emulate them. Try to consistently set a higher bar than that exemplified by your tenured colleagues—in this way, you cannot help but meet and even exceed the standards at UTSA.

Consider the fact that, when you apply for tenure, your department chair will send your materials out to several external reviewers who will then advise the university about the impact of your scholarly work. What those reviewers say will be influenced in part by whether they are already familiar with your work. Do the things necessary to make sure as many potential external reviewers as possible know about your work in advance. This means doing such things as publishing your work, submitting grant proposals, exhibiting your creative work (if applicable), performing, attending meetings and making presentations, being active in a professional society, and seeking advice from leaders in your sub-field. If you engage in these kinds of activities, you will be doing all the things we expect you to do in preparation for your tenure application.

Pay attention to your own effectiveness in the classroom and take steps to improve it, even if your students give you good reviews. The act of participating in teaching-improvement workshops speaks volumes about your dedication to the education of your students. Think about what you want your students to learn, and how you want them to develop in your courses, and then take steps to make sure that you are helping them achieve those expectations. Take assessment of learning outcomes seriously and close the loop: use the results of assessment to change your approach in the classroom. Being an effective instructor is mostly dependent upon your desire to help students succeed.

Show your willingness to participate in service activities at the department level. In general, your service activities will be at the department, rather than the college or university, level. Your departmental colleagues want to know that you are someone that they will be able to depend upon to carry your share of the workload. This service also allows you to understand department norms and expectations. Professional and community service is also valued, but it should not substitute for committee and other service at UTSA. You should be wary of formal administrative roles (*e.g.* assistant chair, *etc.*) that may impair your ability to develop a scholarly record commensurate with tenure. You should consult with your Chair about the appropriate service load for tenure-track faculty in your department.

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 a tenure and promotion application. Tenure is not a constitutional right that is yours to lose. It is something that must be earned through your demonstration that you are the kind of scholar-teacher whose contributions will drive excellence at the university for years to come. No other occupation, short of
appointment to the federal judiciary, provides comparable job security and freedom to exercise intellectual curiosity and discovery. Your tenured colleagues may not be perfect, but they are entrusted with the primary evaluation of your suitability to join their ranks.

**Full Professor Criteria**

A simple enunciation of the criteria to be used for promotion to full professor is difficult for a university in transition such as UTSA. As we strive for national research university status, it will be increasingly important that our 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 promotion to full professor, faculty should demonstrate the following qualities:

- They are active scholars and whose scholarship manifests an inherent desire to learn about the world and the human condition within it.
- They are devoted and effective teachers who promote student success, both inside and outside the classroom and laboratory.
- They are 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 through achieving at least one of the following:
  - a national or international reputation for their research/scholarly/creative activities as indicated by refereed publications in journals or publishing houses of the first rank, peer reviews of scholarly and/or creative work, competitiveness for grants, and external awards and recognition.
  - recognition for the quality and quantity of their instruction-related activities, including contributions to pedagogy within their academic sub-field, authorship of leading textbooks, significant commitment to advising and mentoring students leading to successful student outcomes, and awards for teaching excellence.
  - distinction for leadership activities at both the university and external levels, including significant leadership service as a faculty administrator (chair, director, associate dean, dean, vice provost, provost), officer in a prominent national organization or academic society whose activities are related to their role as a faculty member, or awards for community or disciplinary service.

There is significant latitude for departments and colleges to interpret these criteria for promotion liberally, and to subject them to their own disciplinary lens and filter. It is the intention of the university to utilize promotion to full professor to recognize faculty who have made major contributions to the mission of the university, and by extension, to the national community of faculty in their respective disciplines.
As in the case of the award of tenure, only candidates that receive consistent support for promotion to full professor at the departmental and college levels of the review process have a strong likelihood of success.

**Review Process**

The review process for promotion and tenure applications involves no fewer than seven levels of review, including the Departmental Faculty Review Advisory Committee (DFRAC), the chair, the College Faculty Review Advisory Committee (CFRAC), the dean, the University Faculty Review Advisory Committee (UFRAC), 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 promotion and tenure. The role of each entity in this review hierarchy can be summarized as follows:

**DFRAC**—a full and detailed review of the candidate’s performance during the probationary period or period since last promotion. The DFRAC provides a peer review by those members of the university community best qualified to judge the quality of the candidate’s activities. Accordingly, the DFRAC should provide a detailed written analysis of the candidate’s instructional, research/scholarly/creative, and service activities. The final recommendation of the DFRAC should be based upon that analysis and should report the final tally of any votes taken by the committee, including any abstentions or absences. All votes should be by secret ballot so that the votes of individuals are not divulged. Only DFRAC members physically present for the discussion should participate in the vote of the committee.

**Department Chair**—a full and detailed review of the candidate’s performance during the probationary period or period since last promotion, from the perspective of the long-term needs of the department. The chair should independently evaluate the candidate’s application packet, but consider the recommendations of the DFRAC in arriving at a recommendation. The chair’s report should succinctly amplify points in the DFRAC report where there is agreement, and fully explain the reasons for any differences of opinion with the DFRAC report. The Chair’s report should also briefly explain the process for selecting external reviewers, summarize the reviewers’ qualifications for evaluating the case, and highlight important and relevant elements from the external reviewer reports. When the case is forwarded to the college, the Chair shall notify the candidate(s) in writing about the nature of the DFRAC and Chair’s recommendations. For example, the email or memo could state “your case has been forwarded to the Dean with a positive recommendation from the DFRAC and the Department Chair regarding your promotion and tenure case.” If the DFRAC and Chair differ in their recommendations, the email or memo could state “your case has been forwarded to the Dean with a mixed recommendation regarding your promotion and tenure case.” Likewise, if the departmental recommendations are both negative, the email or memo should follow the earlier examples. Ideally, the Chair should
provide verbal feedback to the DFRAC at the end of the departmental review and discuss areas of concurrence and disagreement.

**CFRAC**—a comprehensive review of the candidate’s packet, and DFRAC and Chair’s recommendations. The CFRAC provides a more general peer review from within the context of the college as a whole, ensuring that each department in the college is upholding equivalent standards for promotion and tenure. The CFRAC should provide a report outlining the justifications for its final recommendations, and may cite the DFRAC report and Chair’s report liberally to highlight agreement or disagreement with previous recommendations. In cases where the CFRAC is in full agreement with the analysis of the DFRAC and Chair, it may provide a succinct report stating its agreement. The CFRAC should exercise all votes by secret ballot and report the numerical results of those votes, including abstentions and absences. Only CFRAC members physically present for the discussion should participate in the vote of the committee.

**Dean**—an independent, comprehensive review of the candidate’s packet, taking the DFRAC, Chair’s, and CFRAC recommendations into consideration. The Dean is responsible for maintaining high standards for promotion and tenure within the college and for analyzing cases in the context of the long-term needs of the college. The Dean should provide a written analysis of each case, but may liberally cite opinions and analysis provided by earlier levels of review. In cases where the Dean is in agreement with all previous recommendations and feels that the case has been sufficiently analyzed in earlier reports, it is sufficient to provide a simple statement of agreement. When all cases from the college are transmitted to the Provost’s Office for university-level review, the Dean shall notify all candidate(s) in writing about the nature of the CFRAC and Dean’s recommendations. For example, the email or memo could state “your case has been forwarded to the Provost’s Office with a positive recommendation from the CFRAC and the Dean regarding your promotion and/or tenure case.” If the CFRAC and Dean differ in their recommendations, the email or memo could state “your case has been forwarded to the Provost’s Office with a mixed recommendation regarding your promotion and/or tenure case.” Likewise, if the college recommendations are both negative, the email or memo should follow the earlier examples. Ideally, the Dean should also provide verbal feedback to the CFRAC at the end of the college-level review and discuss areas of concurrence and disagreement.

**UFRAC**—a general analysis of the earlier reviews (DFRAC, Chair, CFRAC, Dean) of the candidate’s packet to ensure both uniformity of standards and that sufficient care has been taken in evaluating all relevant aspects of the candidate’s performance. The UFRAC should refrain from engaging in a detailed analysis of the candidate’s performance insofar as its membership is unlikely to have disciplinary expertise overlapping that of the candidate. The UFRAC should report all votes (once again, taken by secret ballot and including abstentions and absences), and need only provide a written analysis for those cases in which they disagree with the final recommendations of the earlier levels of review. In cases where there is disagreement among the earlier levels of review, the UFRAC should explain which parts of the earlier analyses are more compelling and thus led to the UFRAC’s ultimate recommendation. Only UFRAC members physically present for the discussion should participate in the vote of the committee.
Provost— an independent review of the candidate’s packet, and general analysis of the earlier reviews (DFRAC, Chair, CFRAC, Dean, UFRAC). The Provost is responsible for maintaining equivalent, and high, standards across the university and for analyzing each case in the context of the institution’s long-term needs. The Provost shall compile a summary of the entire set of cases evaluated, including the recommendations made at each level of review, and make recommendations to the President. Following the President’s deliberations and final decisions, the Provost should ideally meet with the UFRAC to discuss areas of concurrence and disagreement in individual cases.

President— an independent review of the candidate’s packet, and general analysis of the earlier reviews (DFRAC, Chair, CFRAC, Dean, UFRAC, 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 promotion and/or tenure concerning the outcome of the university’s review process.

General Guidelines for the DFRAC and CFRAC

The DFRAC and CFRAC for each department and college, respectively, shall be constituted as indicated in the policies and procedures cited in the Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP), Section 2.10. The roles and responsibilities of each of these committees are outlined in the previous section on “Roles of Review Entities.”

In addition to the policies expressed under HOP 2.10, the DFRAC and CFRAC should adhere to the following guidelines. Careful adherence to these policies and guidelines is necessary to ensure a fair, objective, and consistent process throughout the review of each case.

- The DFRAC and CFRAC function exclusively to conduct internal peer evaluations for the purpose of making recommendations on:
  - faculty reappointment;
  - tenure of an untenured associate professor;
  - promotion to associate professor with tenure;
  - promotion to professor; or
  - the initial appointment of a faculty member with tenure.

  The committees shall limit their recommendations to these actions, as appropriate.

- Faculty members serving on the DFRAC and CFRAC are responsible for reading all tenure and promotion materials, reviewing the applicant’s performance in each of the performance criteria thoroughly and participating in committee discussions and formulating committee recommendations. Voting by proxy, email, absentee, etc., to recommend denial of tenure and promotion or to recommend promotion and tenure is not permitted.

- The analysis of the DFRAC and CFRAC should indicate the factors that contributed to each committee’s recommendations and illuminate any factors that were prominently cited during the deliberations that would have been supportive of a contrary recommendation.
• Recommendations should be based on consistently applied criteria appropriate for the faculty candidate’s academic discipline.

• Faculty serving on the DFRAC and CFRAC should focus on factual information and guard against inaccuracies caused by either emphasis or omission of information.

• At each stage in the review process, all previous recommendations and analyses in the current review cycle are to be taken into account by the reviewing entity and noted in the written analysis.

• Minority opinions and analyses from members of FRACs may optionally be included as part of the FRAC report along with other committee analyses and recommendations (see third bullet above). These “minority reports,” if utilized, may be segregated in a separate section of the report, but should not be submitted separately, and should be made available for review by the entire FRAC to ensure consistency. No other information or correspondence may be placed in the applicant’s file for transmittal to a department chair or onward to the provost.

• Regardless of whether a person is a member of more than one review committee for a case (e.g., DFRAC, CFRAC, and UFRAC), that person may only vote on the case once, and that vote occurs at the department level. If that person is on the DFRAC and CFRAC and/or UFRAC that person may only vote on the case at the department level and may not vote on this case at the CFRAC or UFRAC levels. Even if that person did not serve on the DFRAC and serves only on the CFRAC and/or UFRAC, they may not vote on their department’s cases at either the CFRAC or UFRAC level.

• In the CFRAC and/or UFRAC deliberations, each committee member shall present a balanced description of the decisions rendered at lower levels for cases originating in his/her department or college. It is expected that members of CFRAC will not advocate an outcome not supported by DFRAC (i.e., a member of DFRAC and CFRAC will not advocate at CFRAC an outcome inconsistent with the DFRAC recommendation). In addition, faculty members on the CFRAC may not write the committee report for promotion and tenure cases from their department. Likewise, members of UFRAC will not advocate an outcome not supported by one of the lower levels.

• Only full professors on the DFRAC and CFRAC may consider applicants for promotion to full professor. If those committees, when constituted in accordance with the Handbook and College Bylaws, have fewer than three tenured full professors, the Dean shall appoint additional full professors until there are three on the committee.

• The FRAC report should be signed by all participating members of the review committees. On the signature page, the report should include a header that reads: “We, the undersigned members of the [DFRAC/CFRAC], 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.”

Each dean is responsible for reviewing policies and procedures and these guidelines with department chairs and for assuring that these policies, procedures and instructions are followed.
General Guidelines for the UFRAC

The UFRAC shall be constituted as indicated in the policies and procedures cited in Handbook of Operating Procedures, Section 2.10. The roles and responsibilities of this committee are outlined in the section on “Roles of Review Entities” above.

In addition to the policies expressed under HOP 2.10, the UFRAC should adhere to the following guidelines. Careful adherence to these policies and guidelines is necessary to ensure a fair, objective, and consistent process throughout the review of each case.

- The UFRAC shall function exclusively to conduct internal peer evaluations for the purpose of making recommendations on
  - tenure of an untenured associate professor;
  - promotion to associate professor with tenure; or
  - promotion to professor.

- Faculty members serving on the UFRAC have the responsibility to read all applicants’ packets, to review all earlier evaluations and recommendations, and to participate in committee discussions and formulation of committee recommendations. Voting by proxy, email, absentee, etc., to recommend denial of tenure and promotion or to recommend promotion and tenure is not permitted.

- The analysis of the UFRAC should focus on the factors that caused each earlier review entity to make its recommendations and describe any factors that were prominently cited during the deliberations and which would be supportive of a contrary recommendation. The UFRAC should analyze these reviews to ensure that consistency and objectivity have been exercised at each stage of the earlier reviews in achieving earlier recommendations.

- The UFRAC should evaluate whether or not the earlier recommendations are based on consistently applied criteria appropriate for the faculty candidate’s academic discipline.

- Minority opinions and analyses from members of UFRAC may optionally be included as part of the UFRAC report along with other committee analyses and recommendations (see third bullet above). These “minority reports,” if utilized, may be segregated in a separate section of the report, but should not be submitted separately, and should be made available for review by the entire UFRAC to ensure consistency. No other information or correspondence may be placed in the applicant’s file for transmittal to the Provost.

- When a person is a member of more than one review committee for a case (e.g., DFRAC and UFRAC), that person may only vote on the case once, and that vote occurs at the department level. Even if that person did not serve on the DFRAC and serves only on the CFRAC or UFRAC, they may not vote on their cases at the CFRAC or UFRAC level. In the UFRAC deliberations, each committee member shall present a balanced description rendered at lower levels for cases originating in his/her department or college. It is expected that members of the UFRAC will not advocate an outcome not supported by one of the lower levels.

- The UFRAC 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 UFRAC, 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.”

The Provost is responsible for reviewing policies and procedures and these guidelines with the members of the UFRAC and for assuring that these policies, procedures and instructions are followed.

**Guidelines for Department Chairs**

One of the most important elements in the review process is the recommendation of the Department Chair because the Chair has the greatest competence to review the quality of a candidate’s performance within the academic discipline, balanced by the context of the department’s long-term needs and aspirations. The Chair’s report should contain the following essential elements:

- a summary of the review process followed by the department and DFRAC, including the selection of the external reviewers and the recommendations of the DFRAC;
- a brief description of the qualifications of the external reviewers used to evaluate the impact of the candidate’s research/scholarly/creative products;
- an analysis of the candidate’s contributions in each of the areas of teaching, research/scholarly/creative activity, and service within the context of the department’s long-term needs;
- an explanation of aspects of the case that may be unfamiliar to reviewers at subsequent levels of evaluation— for example,
  - accepted standards for publishing scholarly work, including multiple author protocols,
  - the importance of the candidate’s contribution in any collaborative activities,
  - the quality and impact of the publication outlets, performance venues, or exhibition galleries (as appropriate) utilized by the applicant,
  - clarification of usual citation numbers for researchers in the applicant’s field,
  - the significance of the teaching activities undertaken by the candidate relative to disciplinary norms,
  - departmental expectations for student mentoring at both undergraduate and graduate levels,
  - the significance of any professional service contributions made by the candidate, and
  - the willingness of the candidate to participate on departmental committees, *etc.*
- a succinct statement of the Chair’s recommendation, with explanation of the factors leading to this recommendation.

The Chair should strive to compose the report as objectively as possible, using factual data to support conclusions, and expressing the evaluation in terms of departmental expectations and aspirations. In doing so, the Chair understands that the recommendation is most likely to be upheld if
there is a clear rationale for how the candidate’s promotion and/or tenure will recognize outstanding contributions to the department and help the department improve its overall performance.

**Guidelines for Deans**

The role of the Dean’s recommendation is to uphold high standards across the college and ensure that promotion and/or tenure decisions are made to support the long-term quality and productivity of the college. In all cases, the Dean’s report should provide the following essential information:

- the nature of the department’s recommendations through the DFRAC and Chair;
- the recommendation of the CFRAC and the numerical results of the CFRAC vote; and
- a succinct statement of the Dean’s recommendation for the case.

If the DFRAC, Chair, and CFRAC have all provided consistent analyses and recommendations with which the Dean is in agreement, then the Dean may provide a succinct statement of concurrence with the earlier recommendations.

If earlier recommendations express diverse outcomes, or if the Dean disagrees with their conclusions, then a more comprehensive recommendation should be provided. That report should contain an explanation of the reasons supporting the Dean’s recommendation, citing decisive arguments included in the DFRAC, Chair’s, CFRAC, and external reviewer’s reports. The Dean should take care to express conclusions within the context of the college’s expectations and aspirations for long-term quality among its faculty.

**Appeal of Promotion and Tenure Decisions**

The promotion and tenure review process is a comprehensive one requiring several layers of thorough review. In general, appeals should be made only in cases where new, compelling information relevant to a promotion decision has become available since the completion of the college-level review. Such information might include, for example, a new major publication of research results, a prominent public review of the faculty applicant’s scholarly work, major external competitive funding awarded for research, or receiving a significant award for scholarly achievements.

To file an appeal, see HOP 2.10 section F. Appeal of Promotion and Tenure Decisions

**Retention of Promotion and Tenure Documents**

Promotion and tenure documents are retained in accordance with the university’s official retention schedule, as follows:

- **Record series 3.1.143 Faculty Promotion and Tenure Review Records (Promotion File)** – Evaluations, recommendations memos, etc. are retained for 2 years following the date granting/denying tenure.
• Record series 3.1.137 Employee Recognition Records – A copy of the letter granting/denying tenure and any final determination letter regarding an appeal is retained for 5 years after employment ends.

The university’s full records retention schedule can be accessed through the following link: https://www.utsa.edu/openrecords/retention.html