

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 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 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 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 accomplishments 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 promotion and tenure may be directed to 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 roles and responsibilities of each party at each stage of the process.

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

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 — requirements for Department Chair/School Directors in obtaining external review letters.

Review Process — an outline of the roles and responsibilities of the FRACs, Department Chair/School Director, and dean in conducting the review.

Checklist — a summary of required and optional materials to be submitted for consideration for promotion and tenure.

Help/Support — Scanning Service, SharePoint help, Library services, online tutorials, etc.

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, Department Chair/School Director, 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.

<i>When</i>	<i>Who</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
January	Academic Affairs	Forward forms for early promotion and tenure and promotion to full professor to the colleges and departments.
Feb. 1 st	Dean's Office	Deadline to forward requests for early promotion and tenure review and requests for promotion to full professor to Academic Affairs.
Feb. – March	Academic Affairs	Notify deans and Department Chair/School Directors which faculty members are due to undergo a mandatory review in the coming fall semester.
March	Academic Affairs	Notify tenure-track faculty members that their mandatory review will take place in the coming fall semester.
April – May	Academic Affairs	Set up electronic boxes and forward links to applicants.
Spring	Applicant	Begin assembling materials for application packet; submit names of suggested external reviewers to chair.

Spring	<p>Department Chair/School Director</p> <p>Dean</p>	<p>Solicit suggestions of external reviewers from applicant and faculty; Begin contacting potential reviewers.</p> <p>If the faculty member being reviewed for promotion to full professor is a Department Chair/School Director, the dean shall appoint another faculty member at or above the rank of the Department Chair/School Director to serve in the role of Department Chair/School Director for this process. Provide the name to Academic Affairs.</p>
Early Summer	<p>Applicant</p> <p>Department Chair/School Director</p> <p>Applicant or Department Chair/School Director</p>	<p>Finish assembling application packet and submit to chair.</p> <p>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&T cases no later than September 1st.*</p> <p>Upload peer observer's report(s) and faculty member's report (s) (provided by each candidate).</p>
September	Dean's Office	<p>Provide DFRAC names to Academic Affairs no later than Sept. 1 or the first workday thereafter.</p> <p>Provide CFRAC names to Academic Affairs no later than Sept. 10 or the first workday thereafter.</p>
September	Applicant	Upload promotion and tenure documents to the official Faculty Review folder in SharePoint no later than Sept. 1 st or the first workday thereafter.

September- October	DFRAC	Review application packet and external review letters; Deliberate in closed meeting and vote on case; Prepare a written summary of evaluation analysis
	Department Chair/School Director	Review all application materials, including DFRAC recommendation; Prepare a written recommendation for forwarding to college; Provide a written notification to applicant of the Department's recommendations;
	Department Chair/School Director	Upload DFRAC memo and Department Chair/School Director memo to the official Faculty Review folder in SharePoint;
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.
	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;
	Applicant	Optional opportunity to update file by adding new materials before forwarding to Academic Affairs.

November	College Dean	Application materials due in to Academic Affairs by the November 1st, or the first work day thereafter
November-December	UFRAC Academic Affairs	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.
December-January	Provost	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.
January	President	Review all application materials, including recommendations at each level; Render final decisions concerning promotion and tenure recommendations.
January	Academic Affairs	Prepare written notification to all applicants concerning outcome of promotion and tenure review.
May	President	Forward positive recommendations to UT System by May 1st.
August	UT Board of Regents	Approve promotion and tenure recommendations from all campuses in UT System.

*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. 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 preferred submission format for materials is pdf (however; please do not lock/restrict/password protect any documents).

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

1. a statement of self-evaluation and COVID-19 Impact Checklist
2. a professional curriculum vitae
3. evaluations and recommendations by the various levels of review
4. documentation of teaching effectiveness
 - summary of course evaluations (complete template)
 - peer observer's report(s)
 - faculty member's report(s)
5. documentation of research/scholarly/creative activities
6. summary of service activities and responsibilities
7. optional supplementary materials
8. 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 #1–2 and #4 – 8 above (except that the peer observer's report(s) and the faculty member's report(s) is uploaded by the chair/school director); the faculty review advisory committees, chair/school director, dean and provost are responsible for appending materials contained in #3.

Items #1 – 3 constitute the review materials utilized by each of the FRACs, the chair, the dean, the provost, and the president in reviewing the application. Items #4 – 8 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 (#1 and 2) plus the documentation of research/scholarly creative activities (#5) comprise the information sent to external reviews for their evaluation. The COVID-19 Impact Checklist (#1) will not be shared with external reviewers and is for internal purposes only (Department Chair/School Director/school director and dean). This information is summarized in the table below.

Review Activity	Item Number							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
External reviews	X Except COVID- 19 Impact Checklist	X			X			
Dept. review	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
College review	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Univ. review	X	X	X					

Items #1 -2 and #4-8 should be posted in the official Faculty Review folder in SharePoint for review by FRAC members. Item #3 should be uploaded to SharePoint when they are completed. Each of these items is described more fully in the following sections.

Checklist

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 are provided on the website.

1. Statement of Self-Evaluation and COVID-19 Impact Checklist

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. In addition, the self-evaluation should explicitly address the attributes provided in the *Principles Guiding Tenure and Promotion*.

- 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 including the impact and benefit of their 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 10 pages long.

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.

2. Professional Vitae

<i>Name and Contact Information</i>	This should include UTSA address, phone number, and email address, as well as current academic rank (for example, Assistant Professor or Associate Professor).
<i>Educational Background</i>	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.
<i>Professional Employment History</i>	List all positions held in sequential order, with applicable dates, since earning the baccalaureate degree, including the present position at UTSA.
<i>Awards and Honors</i>	List any awards, honors, prizes, competitions, or other recognition received related to professional activities.
<i>Research/Scholarly/Creative Activities Summary</i>	Summarize all products of research/scholarly/creative activities, including publications, exhibitions, performances, architectural projects, reviews, or other documentation of scholarly contributions. <i>All products should include the date and title of publication/exhibition/performance, the impact (e.g. impact factors, citations, Almetrics, etc.) the venue, and where applicable, the inclusive page numbers or size of the scholarly contribution.</i> 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. Use separate headings for publication status such as Published, Accepted, Under Review/Submitted, and In preparation with published works listed first.
<i>Scholarly Presentations</i>	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 Chair/School Director, 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.

3. 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:

<i>Item</i>	<i>Responsible Individual</i>	<i>When</i>
External review letters	Department Chair/School Director	Prior to DFRAC review
DFRAC analysis* Chair's recommendation*	Department Chair/School Director	Upon completion Upon completion
CFRAC analysis* Dean's recommendation	Dean	Upon completion Upon completion
UFRAC analysis	UFRAC Chair	Upon completion of UFRAC review

*UTSA is committed to encouraging, facilitating, and rewarding interdisciplinary educational and scholarly activities. Joint appointments within UTSA create the opportunity for faculty to move across disciplinary boundaries. For joint appointments, DFRAC and CFRAC membership and analysis should follow the established Joint Faculty Appointment Agreement. [The template](#) is available on the Academic Affairs website.

4. 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.

<i>Semester</i>	<i>Course No.</i>	<i>Course Type</i>	<i>New prep?</i>	<i>Course Enrollment</i>	<i>No. of Responses</i>	<i>Course rating</i>	<i>Instructor rating</i>
SP2011	ABC nnn3	LD, UD, or GR	NEW	xxx	yyy	X.X	Y.Y
.	<i>Note: LD = lower division,</i>						
.	<i>UD = upper division,</i>						
.	<i>GR = graduate-level</i>						

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/School Director according to the Peer Observation Guidelines, but no later than Sept. 1st, or the first workday thereafter.

<i>Faculty Member's Report</i>	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/School Director according to the Peer Observation Guidelines, but no later than Sept. 1 st , or the first workday thereafter.
<i>Teaching Portfolios</i>	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.
<i>Instructional Development</i>	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.
<i>Instructional Grants</i>	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.
<i>Teaching Awards</i>	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, <i>etc.</i>), and institution.
<i>Students Mentored</i>	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.

5. Documentation of Research/Scholarly/Creative Activities

<i>Scholarly Products</i>	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 factor of the journal, citation indices, Altmetrics, etc.) of the published work.* 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/School Director.

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 communications.

6. 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.

7. *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 Academic Affairs' website. Applicants are asked to provide materials in an electronic/digital format uploaded to the official Faculty Review folder in SharePoint

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.

In extraordinary cases, where the supplementary materials might clarify a point in dispute from earlier reviews, the UFRAC may also request access to 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. 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 University Library. By storing these materials online, the intent is that they are made accessible for the convenience of the DFRAC, Department Chair/School Director, 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. For your research/scholarly/creative activities, it is important that all products should include the date and title of publication/exhibition/performance, the impact factor of the journal, number of citations for the publication, the venue, and where applicable, the inclusive page numbers or size of the scholarly contribution. 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

[External Review Letter Template](#)

[Letter to External Reviewers from the Provost related to COVID-19 Impacts](#)

[Worksheet for Outside Evaluators](#)

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 shall be no less than four (4), and no more than seven (7), letters from independent external reviewers that evaluate the faculty candidate's academic record in the dossier in order for the candidate to be considered for promotion or tenure.
- External reviewers should themselves be experts in the faculty candidate's discipline, sub-field or area, and should not be a past mentor, dissertation advisor or a frequent or current (within last 5 years) collaborator, nor have a personal relationship with the candidate. Each reviewer should be asked to outline in the report any past professional and/or personal association that (s)he may have with the faculty candidate.
- Reviewers should ideally hold full professor rank or equivalent and be currently active, productive researchers, scholars or artists. 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, for example, from Carnegie R1 or AAU institutions (including medical school colleagues as warranted). One of the chief purposes of promotion and tenure is to ensure that the university is making progress towards its strategic goals and aspirations, which cannot occur unless advice is continually solicited from those who represent aspirant institutions.

- Department Chair/School Directors shall document all reviewer nominations and the selection process on the required “Worksheet for Outside Evaluators”, which will be approved by the Dean and included in the candidate’s dossier.
- Responsibility for choosing external reviewers rests with the Department Chair/School Director, but should involve consultation with others, including the faculty candidate, senior faculty members and the DFRAC.
- The list should include sufficient in number of potential reviewers (that is typically seven to ten and five accept request) to yield at least the minimum number (4) of independent evaluation letters required to advance the dossier for consideration. Department Chair/School Directors are responsible for properly managing this process and ensuring at least the minimum number is achieved in order to advance the dossier, as required, and *shall seek well in advance assistance from the Dean to remedy any challenges such as insufficient number of reviewers.*
- College associate deans should conduct a check-in with Department Chair/School Directors in late July/early August to see if any assistance is needed in getting the sufficient number of evaluation letters.
- Each department should develop specific written guidelines for soliciting suggestions for reviewers and work to ensure the integrity of the process. That process shall include:
 - consideration of names suggested by the faculty candidate;
 - consideration of names proposed by senior faculty and DFRAC members in the same general area as the faculty candidate; and,
 - identification of those nominated reviewers identified by the faculty candidate who are unsuitable due to a real or perceived conflict of interest;
 - construction of the total list of reviewers that includes names suggested by the faculty candidate, as well as those that are not suggested by the candidate (*no more than half are expected to be from the candidate*).

Process of Soliciting External Reviews

- During the spring prior to the promotion and tenure review, the Department Chair/School Director shall solicit suggestions of potential reviewers from the faculty candidate, DFRAC and senior faculty in the same general sub-field as the candidate, and record all reviewers nominated on the Required Worksheet.
- The Department Chair/School Director reviews the nominations codified on the Worksheet for obvious real or perceived conflicts of interest, and if noted, checks the “no” box in the “Independent Column”. If the Department Chair/School Director elects to proceed with soliciting a review, it is considered a letter of support and not an independent evaluation.
- The Department Chair/School Director contacts prospective reviewers to ascertain their availability to provide a review, and notes the response on the Worksheet.
- If the list of potential reviewers solicited by the Department Chair/School Director is exhausted the approved list without yielding at least four independent reviewers, the

Department Chair/School Director should consult with the Dean for assistance with remedy and request additional names from the faculty candidate, DFRAC and the senior faculty in the same general sub-field as the candidate.

- Once the list of reviewers is finalized, the Department Chair/School Director shall forward the application packet, including relevant work products and summary of the candidate's workload assignment, to the external reviewers for their evaluation. Materials should be sent to reviewers early enough to allow the reviewer adequate time to conduct the review as well as for the department to review the case.
- The Department Chair/School Director shall solicit the review using [the required template including the additional letter from the Provost to external reviewers](#). Reviewers are focused on evaluation of the candidate's record of accomplishments in research, scholarship or creative arts, and may optionally provide information about the impact of any professional (disciplinary) service rendered by the faculty candidate and any of the candidate's instruction-related activities if the reviewer has specific, relevant observations by which to evaluate those activities (e.g., use of nationally disseminated textbook authored by the candidate or service with the candidate on a disciplinary society or agency review board).
- The Department Chair/School Director shall 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.
- Upon receipt of the evaluation and vitae from the reviewer, the Department Chair/School Director reviews the letter to evaluate any professional or personal affiliations or relationships by the reviewer with the candidate. The Chair makes the final determination of Independence, and so notes on the Worksheet. *Evaluations not determined to be independent by the Department Chair/School Director will be considered only as letters of support and not included in the evaluative process.*
- After receipt of letters, the Department Chair/School Director transmits the Worksheet codifying the external reviewer process to the Dean for review and approval, prior to inclusion in the candidate's dossier.

Principles guiding 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." 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.

Principles guiding Tenure

Achieving Carnegie R1 designation is a significant milestone in UTSA's strategic vision to become a model for student success and a great public research university. Our standards for scholarly achievement and academic excellence and the attendant decisions concerning the awarding of tenure to faculty are commensurate with this achievement of R1. What defines our

core is scholarly excellence in all its varieties - from fundamental, interdisciplinary, applied, community engaged and translational – which are particularly relevant to UTSA as a Hispanic Serving Institution and urban-serving university. Furthermore, we value and recognize the pivotal role of faculty in our interconnected, mutually supportive institutional goals of student success and excellence through impact and innovation. Accordingly — and fundamental to our university’s mission — successful applicants for tenure and promotion will have the following attributes:

- **Significant scholarly contribution** as active researcher, scholar, and creative artist. Successful applicants will be engaged in discovery — exploring the nature of the world and the diverse human condition in new ways — which advances new knowledge, perspectives and understanding.
- **Independence.** Work put forward as a part of this evaluation shall include ideas and concepts developed by the applicant, and is beyond those explored in the applicant’s graduate dissertation and thesis, as well as distinct and distinguishable from those of mentors, advisors, collaborators or colleagues.
- **Progressive record of achievement.** Academic efforts and outcomes should build and unfold, showing evidence of ongoing and evolutionary development of expertise, skills and accomplishments.
- **Innovation.** Works put forward as a part of this evaluation should break new ground, advance new understanding, or improve learning or inclusion (e.g., utilizing or developing new pedagogical approaches or evaluation methods in novel instructional activities; disrupting current thinking by integrating threads; connecting or integrating methods from multiple disciplines that may reveal new lines of inquiry or pedagogy; or translating scholarly outcomes into new products, technologies or programs; to name a few).
- **National / International Dissemination.** Scholarship by the faculty member should have broad dissemination in top-rate venues of scholarly discoveries, works and creations, manifested by, for example, publications, exhibitions, reviews, performances, products, technologies or presentations, or proceedings, extending to scholarly communities nationally and internationally, or authoring widely adopted textbooks, national society presentations, federal grants, or national awards for pedagogical innovation or systematic evaluation of instructional methodology.
- **Impact.** Discoveries, works and creations that “matter,” addressing important and unresolved questions or matters in a field or area of inquiry, including interdisciplinary, and as such, are cited and recognized by other researchers, scholars or creative artists. Impact can be evinced by, for example, citations, references, honorifics and similar recognition, patents or commercialization, programs, policies, grants or other similar contractual awards. Examples of impact might include applying pedagogies that measurably improve student learning and

success or that expand access or inclusion; translating a new idea into a community service program to promote positive change; serving on a national advisory panel that propels new legislation or public discourse; or translating findings into technologies, products and other entrepreneurial activities.

- **Benefit.** Academic efforts and outcomes provide recognizable value. Examples might include scholarship that makes available opportunities for undergraduate and/or graduate students, particularly those from underrepresented groups, to be involved personally in the act of discovery, scholarship and creation; activities that model the excitement of intellectual engagement to promote lifelong learning or uses inquiry to systematically demonstrate the application of new pedagogy on classroom outcomes; or service to the discipline or area by serving as an evaluative reviewer.
- **Engagement.** Examples of engagement might include fostering the success and development of students into transformative leaders of a diverse, inclusive society within the local to global context; serving with distinction in roles to support a federal agency or institution, academic society, community agency, or private and not-for-profit industry; advancing UTSA as an exemplar of innovative excellence through service that substantively positively impacts the university's trajectory and its effects towards our goals.
- **Bearer of the standard of the university's future.** Contributions by the faculty member should measurably improve the department, college, and university by raising the standard for the next generation of tenure-track faculty at UTSA. Each department/school and college and leader must consciously ask the question, "Does this faculty member raise the level of our department/school, college and university by their presence, activity and impact, or not?" If the answer is not affirmative, then tenure should not be recommended.

For tenure-track 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.

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, the expectation is that early tenure is reserved for faculty with demonstrated, exceptional achievements relative to years in rank in research, scholarship and creative activity, instruction and service. As such, although the overall record for scholarly achievement, teaching excellence, and participation in service for an "early" candidate shall be no less in terms of both quantity and quality to that of a successful candidate coming up in the expected sixth year, a candidate who is showing "good progress" toward tenure is not appropriate to be considered for early tenure. Note that opting out of the

automatic Covid extension does not constitute an early review, but rather forgoes the additional year extension.

For tenure-track faculty candidates with years in faculty rank (or equivalent, NOT graduate or post-doctoral appointments) gained at other institutions, the resultant scholarly productivity and impact, teaching excellence and service participation completed prior to joining to UTSA as faculty shall be included as a part of the evaluation for tenure and promotion, including early tenure.

Before initiating the process for an early tenure and promotion consideration, tenure-track faculty should consult with the cognizant Chair/Director and Dean. If there is not unqualified support for an early application, it is most prudent to apply for promotion and tenure on the expected schedule.

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 application is not yet ready for an affirmative decision.

Principles for Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to Full Professor is predicated on the same core tenets articulated above for the promotion to Associate Professor – that, is standards for achievements in rank that constitute academic excellence of premier national (e.g., Carnegie “Research 1” or AAU and equivalent) research universities. First and foremost, the university utilizes promotion to full professor to recognize those faculty who have 1) in the period since tenure, demonstrated a continued or accelerated rate of academic achievement relative to period prior, and 2) have made major, distinctive contributions to the mission of the university centered in outstanding research, scholarship or creative arts; and are devoted, accomplished teachers who advance student success in and out of the classroom, recognized leaders of their respective discipline or area and citizens of our communities. As such, candidates are expected to have a sustained, consistent record of academic success and to be substantive, intellectual leaders in the national / international communities of faculty in their respective disciplines or areas. 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.

Candidates are wise to consult with their Chair/Director and Dean before pursuing promotion to Professor to gain assistance in the evaluation of readiness and success. It is expected that seeking promotion to Full Professor is undertaken once a distinguished record of faculty leadership is established, and is done so with thought and respect for the evaluative process.

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 present in the meeting 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 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. In addition, the chair must make a final, definitive recommendation. 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/School Director 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 brief evaluation and analysis justifying the 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 present in the meeting 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. 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 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 Academic Affairs 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 Academic Affairs 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—The UFRAC should provide an independent written evaluation and analysis for each case justifying the recommendations, at a level of detail that comports with the university-wide perspective and includes 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. .. 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. The UFRAC should report all votes by secret ballot and report the numerical results of those votes, including abstentions and absences. Only UFRAC members present in the meeting 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.

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. These meetings can occur in a virtual format, synchronously. As outlined in HOP 2.10, IX. E. 4. g DFRAC and CFRAC Committee chairs will maintain attendance records of all meetings. Only committee members who attend all deliberations for a given candidate may vote on the application of that candidate. In order to keep the voting anonymous, it is encouraged to utilize software such as the poll feature in zoom, mentimeter.com or another poll software. 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, CFRAC and UFRAC 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 FRAC memo, 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/School Director 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 and/or UFRAC will not advocate for a particular decision. 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 Chair/School Directors 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. These meetings can occur in a virtual format, synchronously. UFRAC Committee chair will maintain attendance records of all meetings. Only committee members who attend all deliberations for a given candidate may vote on the application of that candidate. In order to keep the voting anonymous, it is encouraged to utilize software such as the poll feature in zoom, mentimeter.com or another poll software. Voting by proxy, email, absentee, etc., to recommend denial of tenure and promotion or to recommend promotion and tenure is not permitted.
- The UFRAC should provide an independent written evaluation and analysis for each case justifying the recommendations, at a level of detail that comports with the university-wide perspective. The analysis of the UFRAC should 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 both uniformity of standards and that sufficient care has been taken in evaluating all relevant aspects of the candidate’s performance.
- 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 Chair/School Directors

One of the most important elements in the review process is the recommendation of the Department Chair/School Director 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 include an independent, comprehensive review of the candidate's packet and 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>