Promotion Application Guidelines for Fixed Term-Track Faculty
The University of Texas at San Antonio

This set of guidelines provides information for Fixed-Term-Track (FTT) faculty applicants for promotion as prescribed by the *Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP), chapter 2.50 "Fixed-Term-Track Faculty Recruitment, Evaluation, and Promotion"* and for department review committees (DRCs), Department Chair/School Directors, and deans involved in the review process. These guidelines are reviewed annually and updated as needed by the Provost and Academic Affairs staff.

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

UTSA's process is intended to be as forthright and transparent as possible, and as such, guidance on the respective roles and responsibilities, processes, and criteria are provided here. Questions concerning the university's procedures for Fixed Term-Track faculty promotion may be directed to Academic Affairs.

These guidelines are divided into sections:

Overview of Process — a brief description of the timeline for review and the roles and 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.
Principles Guiding Promotion — information about the criteria to be followed in reviewing promotion applications.
Review Process — an outline of the roles and responsibilities of the FRACs, Department Chair/School Directors, and deans in conducting the review.

Overview of Process

The purpose of the promotion process is to perform an objective evaluation of each case at several levels of review. Therefore, each case goes through four levels of independent review before a final recommendation is achieved: DRC, chair, dean, and provost.

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

When	*Who*	*Responsibility*
January	Applicant	Upload promotion documents to the official FTT Promotion Review Workflow form in Digital Measures Workflow no later than January 31st or the first workday thereafter (links sent in December).
February	DRC	Review application submission; Deliberate in closed meeting and vote on case; Prepare a written summary of evaluation analysis in Digital Measures Workflow.
	Department Chair/School Director	Review all application materials, including DRC recommendation; Prepare a written recommendation for forwarding to the dean in Digital Measures Workflow.
March	Department Chair/School Director	Provide a written notification to applicant of the Department's recommendation. Department Chair/School Director Review application submission, DRC report, and chair recommendation. Prepare a written recommendation for forwarding to the Provost in Digital Measures Workflow. Provide a written notification to applicant of the college's recommendation;
	College Dean	

Peer observation reports,

Application materials are due in the Academic Affairs by April 1st, or the first work day thereafter.

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 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. a statement of self-evaluation
2. a professional vitae
3. evaluations and recommendations by various levels of review
4. documentation of teaching effectiveness for applicants in the Lecturer, Professor of Instruction, Professor of Practice, and Clinical Professor series, OR

    documentation of research/scholarly/creative activities for applicants in the Professor of Research series
5. summary of service activities and responsibilities
6. optional supplemental 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 – 2 and #4 – 6 above and the faculty review advisory committee and chair are responsible for appending materials contained in #3.

Checklist

A checklist of the essential contents of the review package, as well as a checklist of possible optional supplementary materials that may be submitted can be found on Academic Affairs' webpage.

1. Statement of Self-Evaluation

The statement of self-evaluation should be organized in two sections, outlining the applicant's activities, experiences, and plans in the areas of teaching (Lecturer, Professor of Instruction, Professor of Practice, and Clinical Professor series) or research (Research Professor series), and service. Optional additional sections on research for applicants in the Lecturer, Professor of Instruction, Professor of Practice, and Clinical Professor series or on teaching for applicants in the Research Professor series should be included if appropriate.

- 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.

- The service section should provide an overview of service activities and explain the applicant's participation in key service roles.

The statement of self-evaluation should be no more than 5 pages.

Covid Impact Checklist*

We also recognize that the COVID-19 pandemic may have caused varying disruptions to faculty in their teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service goals. Furthermore, we understand that these disruptions impact individual faculty in unique ways, based on differing responsibilities and circumstances, and differing timescales and intensities. The COVID_19 Impact Checklist allows faculty to provide information on disruptions to their teaching, research / scholarship / creative activity, and/or service that provide additional, important evaluation context.
*Faculty will submit their Covid Impact Checklist in Digital Measures Workflow after the DRC has completed their evaluation, before the review packet is forwarded to the Department Chair/School Director.

2. Professional Vitae
The sections of the professional vitae may vary based on the faculty member's appointment.

Name and Contact Information	This should include UTSA address, phone number, and email address, as well as current academic rank.
Educational Background	List all institutions from which a degree was earned, including the degree received and the major field of study.
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.
Teaching Activities	List all formal courses taught during the past 2 years, 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.

Research/Scholarly/Creative Activities

Summarize all products of research/scholarly/creative activities, including publications, exhibitions, performances,

architectural projects, or other documentation of scholarly contributions. *All products should include the date and title of publication/exhibition/performance, the (e.g. impact factors, citations , Almetrics, etc.) venue, and where applicable, the inclusive page numbers or size of the scholarly contribution.* 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.

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.

Service Activities   Provide separate listings of all committee assignments, assigned administrative activities (for example, adviser of record, *etc*.), student-centered service, for example faculty adviser for student organization, and any professional service activities. Each activity should include the dates of participation, the organizational level of the activity (for example, depart- ment, college, *etc*.), and any leadership roles played.

3. 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:

Item	Responsible Individual	When
DRC analysis	DRC Chair	Upon completion
Chair's recommendation	Department Chair/School Director	Upon completion

Dean's recommendation	Dean	Upon completion

4A. Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness

Listing of Courses with Teaching Evaluation Summaries

Provide a table of courses taught during the evaluation period (the probationary period, the period since the last promotion, or the past two years), 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.

Semester	*Course No.*	*Course Type*	*New prep?*	*Course Enrollmt.*	*No. of Responses*	*Course Rating*	*Instructor Rating*
SP2011	ABC nnn3	LD, UD, or GR	NEW	xxx	Yyy	X.X	Y.Y
. . .	*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 reports to the Department Chair/School Director according to the Peer Observation Guidelines.

Teaching Portfolios

For one or two representative courses taught, provide a portfolio containing the course syllabus, and examples of exams, handouts, problem sets, and other written assignments.

Instructional Development

List any workshops or other related meetings attended (or organized) to increase pedagogical effectiveness. This information should include dates, formats, locations, and names of organizers.

Instructional Grants

List all grants related to instructional activities.

Teaching Awards

List any awards received for excellence in university-level teaching. Indicate the date, award name, awarding unit (for example, college, university, *etc*.), and institution.

Students Mentored

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

4B. 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. *All relevant products should include the impact (e.g. impact factors, citations , Almetrics, etc.) of the published work.* Applicants should provide a hard copy of any full books authored or edited by the faculty member. 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/School Director. 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/School Director.

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 communication.

5. 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. 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.

6. Supplemental materials   Additional material**,** if pertinent, can be included here.

Special Note to Faculty

These guidelines are intended to help you prepare a well-documented case for promotion. As you prepare your packet, please consider how readily a reader may access and absorb the material it contains. Please be as concise and succinct as possible in each section of the form.

Principles Guiding Promotion

For general guidelines to the criteria expected for successful promotion and tenure, please see the UTSA *Handbook of Operating Procedures*, *chapter 2.50 "Fixed-Term-Track Faculty Recruitment, Evaluation, and Promotion."* Although specific expectations vary by discipline and by other guidance put forth by the Academic Colleges and individual Departments, the over-arching university standards for excellence that comport with the university's goals are described below.

We value and recognize the pivotal role of FTT faculty in our interconnected, mutually supportive institutional goals of student success and excellence through innovation. Accordingly — and fundamental to our university's mission — successful applicants for promotion will have the following attributes in primarily teaching or research, and show evidence of progressive record of achievement and engagement:

- **Excellence in teaching.** Successful applicants in the Professor of Instruction and Practice series, and in the Clinical Professor series will have a sustained record of excellence in teaching as evidenced by peer observation reports, student evaluations, curriculum design, and the demonstration of innovative teaching methods.

- **Significant scholarly contribution.** Successful applicants in the Professor of Research series will be active researchers, scholars, and creative artists. Successful applicants will be engaged in discovery — exploring the nature of the world and the diverse human condition in new ways — that advances new knowledge, perspectives, and understanding.

- **Progressive record of achievement**. Academic efforts and outcomes should build and unfold, showing evidence of ongoing and evolutionary development of expertise, skills, and accomplishments.

- **Engagement**. Examples of engagement might include fostering the success and development of students into transformative leaders of a diverse, inclusive society.

HOP 2.50 outlines the promotion timelines for faculty. Faculty member should meet the minimum to go up for promotion. If a part-time faculty member the the percent FTE should be used to determine the time. For example, if 50% FTE Associate Professor of Practice, to meet the min. of 2 years than this would 4 years at 50% FTE.

For FTT faculty candidates with years in faculty rank (or equivalent; note, NOT including graduate or post-doctoral work) gained at other institutions, the review process including the departments, colleges, and the university levels shall include consideration of any scholarly productivity and impacts, teaching excellence, and service participation completed prior to joining UTSA as faculty.

Review Process

The review process for promotion involves four levels of review, including the Departmental Review Committee (DRC), the chair, the dean, and the provost. This structure promotes a thorough, objective review of each case.

Roles of Review Entities

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

DRC— The DRC provides a peer review by those members of the university community best qualified to judge the quality of the candidate's activities. Accordingly, the DRC should provide a detailed written analysis of the candidate's instructional or research/scholarly/creative and service activities. The final recommendation of the DRC should be based upon that analysis and should report the final tally of any votes taken by the committee, including any abstentions or absences.
The DRC should include at least one FTT faculty member at equal or higher rank than the rank to which the candidate is requesting promotion. If the department has no FTT faculty members who would qualify, then an FTT faculty member from another department within the college can be appointed to the DRC for the purpose of reviewing the candidate.

All votes should be by secret ballot so that the votes of individuals are not divulged. Only DRC members present for the discussion should participate in the vote of the committee.

Department Chair/School Director— a full and detailed review of the candidate's performance since hiring or 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 DRC in arriving at a recommendation.
The chair's report should succinctly amplify points in the DRC report where there is agreement, and fully explain the reasons for any differences of opinion with the DRC report. When the case is forwarded to the college, the Chair shall notify the candidate(s) in writing about the nature of the DRC and Chair's recommendations.

Dean— an independent, comprehensive review of the candidate's packet, taking the DRC and Chair's recommendations into consideration. 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 Academic Affairs, the Dean shall notify all candidate(s) in writing about the nature of the Dean's recommendation. Ideally, the Dean should also provide verbal feedback to the Chair at the end of the college-level review and discuss areas of concurrence and disagreement.

Academic Affairs— an independent review of the candidate's packets and general analysis of the earlier reviews (DRC, Chair, and Dean). Academic Affairs is responsible for maintaining equivalent, and high, standards across the university. Academic Affairs will prepare appropriate written notification to all candidates for promotion concerning the outcome of the review process.

General Guidelines for the DRC

The DRC for each department shall be constituted as indicated in the policies and procedures cited in the *Handbook of Operating Procedures* (HOP), Section 2.50.

In addition to the policies expressed under HOP 2.50, the DRC 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 DRC functions to conduct internal peer evaluations for the purpose of making recommendations on faculty promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer and into the professor of instruction, practice, and clinical and research professor series. The committees shall limit their recommendations to these actions, as appropriate.

- Faculty members serving on the DRC are responsible for thoroughly reviewing the applicant's performance in each of the performance criteria and participating in committee discussions and formulating committee recommendations.

- The analysis of the DRC 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 DRC should focus on factual information and guard against inaccuracies caused by either emphasis or omission of information.

- **The DRC 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 DRC 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 Chair/School Directors and for assuring that these policies, procedures, and instructions are followed.

Guidelines for Department Chair/School Directors

The Chair's report should contain the following essential elements:

- a summary of the review process followed by DRC, including the recommendations of the DRC;

- an analysis of the candidate's contributions in the areas of teaching or research/scholarly/creative activity and service;

- 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 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 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 DRC and Chair;

- a succinct statement of the Dean's recommendation for the case.

If the DRC and Chair have 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 DRC and Chair 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 Decisions

The promotion review process is a comprehensive one requiring several layers of thorough review. 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, receiving a significant award for teaching or scholarly achievements, a new major publication of research results, or major external competitive funding awarded for research.

Appeal Procedure

1. The faculty candidate shall first consult with the Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs to discuss the promotion application, and the new information that might support a successful appeal.

2. Within thirty (30) work days of the first work day in April the candidate shall submit the appeal in writing to Academic Affairs.

3. The written appeal is limited to the following materials:

    1. a succinct cover letter explaining the nature of the new material being submitted for consideration and its significance; and

    2. new material in support of the promotion application that was not available prior to the time the case was sent forward by the Dean to Academic Affairs.

4. Academic Affairs shall review the written appeal, but may consult with reviewers from any or all of the review levels used in the promotion processes.

5. Academic Affairs shall inform the candidate in writing of the final decision within twenty (20) work days of receiving the written appeal.

6. Academic Affair's decision is final for the current application review cycle or a mandatory review. If the decision is to deny promotion for a non-mandatory review, then the candidate may reapply in a subsequent academic year.

Retention of Promotion Documents

Promotion documents are retained in accordance with the university's official retention schedule. The university's full records retention schedule can be accessed through the following link: https://www.utsa.edu/openrecords/retention.html