

The University of Texas at Austin
General Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure of
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
(Excluding the Dell Medical School)
2022-23 Academic Year

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section A. OVERVIEW

- A.1 Introduction
- A.2 Levels of Review
- A.3 Minimum Number of Voting Faculty Members for Promotion Review Committees
- A.4 Areas of Faculty Performance Evaluated During the Promotion and Tenure Review
- A.5 Minimum Amount of Qualifying Service at UT Austin
- A.6 Elected Combined Service – Review Time Frame

Section B. CRITERIA FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS

- B.1 Years of Probationary Service at UT Austin
- B.2 On-Time Promotion Review of Tenure-Track Assistant Professors
 - B.2a Maximum Number of Years of Probationary Service at UT Austin*
 - B.2b Elected Combined Service at UT Austin and Other Institutions*
 - B.2c Expectations for On-Time Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure*
 - B.2d Decision Options for Mandatory Review*
- B.3 Accelerated Promotion Review of Tenure-Track Assistant Professors
 - B.3a Years of Probationary or Combined Service*
 - B.3b Expectations for Accelerated Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure*
 - B.3c Decision Options for Accelerated Review*
- B.4 On-Time Promotion Review of Tenure-Track Associate and Full Professors
 - B.4a Maximum Number of Years of Probationary Service at UT Austin*
 - B.4b Expectations for On-Time Promotion*
 - B.4c Decision Options for Mandatory Review of Tenure-Track Associate Professors*
 - B.4d Decision Options for Mandatory Review of Tenure-Track Full Professors*
- B.5 Instructors in a Probationary Status

Section C. CRITERIA FOR TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS

- C.1 Effective Years in Rank at UT Austin
- C.2 On-Time Promotion Review of Tenured Associate Professors
 - C.2a Timing of Review for Tenured Associate Professors to Tenured Full Professors*
 - C.2b Elected Combined Service at UT Austin and Other Institutions*
 - C.2c Expectations for On-Time Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure*
- C.3 Accelerated Promotion Review of Tenured Associate Professors
 - C.3a Years of Effective Years in Rank or Combined Service*
 - C.3b Expectations for Accelerated Promotion to Full Professor with Tenure*
- C.4 Tenured Associate Professors Invoking the Right to Review
- C.5 Expectations for Promotion for Tenured Faculty with Extended Time in Rank
- C.6 Decision Options for Review of Tenured Associate Professors

Section D. DEPARTMENT CHAIR AND DEAN RESPONSIBILITIES

- D.1 Familiarity with Written Guidelines
- D.2 Unbiased Review
- D.3 Additional College/School Guidelines
- D.4 Managing Joint Appointments
- D.5 Conflict of Interest

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

- D.6 Eligibility to Serve as Department Chair for a Promotion Review
- D.7 Eligibility to Serve as Dean for a Promotion Review
- D.8 Candidate Meetings
- D.9 Selecting Reviewers
- D.10 List of Review Committee Members
- D.11 Participation in Deliberations

Section E. CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES

- E.1 Dossier Preparation
- E.2 Candidate Meeting with Supervisor
- E.3 List of Review Committee members and Supervisors
- E.4 List of Promotion Reviewers
- E.5 Candidate's Review of Dossier

Section F. UNIVERSITY OBLIGATIONS

- F.1 Access to Promotion File Materials
 - F.1a Informal Access*
 - F.1b Formal Access*
- F.2 COVID-19 Professional Impact
- F.3 Additions to the Dossier
- F.4 Issues Beyond the Scope of the Promotion and Tenure Process
- F.5 Progression of Promotion Review Cases through Levels of Review

Section G. PROMOTION DOSSIERS

- G.1 Change of Rank Form and Voting
- G.2 Dean Statement
- G.3 Department Chair Statement (applicable for departmentalized colleges)
- G.4 Other Statements (if applicable)
- G.5 Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- G.6 Teaching Statements
 - I. BC/EBC/EC Teaching Statement
 - II. Candidate's Teaching Statement
- G.7 Course Instructor Surveys (CIS)
 - I. Report of Course Rating Averages
 - II. Summary of Course Instructor Survey Results
- G.8 List of Peer Teaching Observers
- G.9 Graduate Students and Postdocs
 - I. Committee Report of Masters and Doctoral Theses
 - II. Postdoctoral Fellows Supervised
- G.10 Research, Scholarship, and Creative Endeavors
 - I. BC/EBC/EC Research, Scholarship, and Creative Endeavors Statement
 - II. List of Five Most Significant Works Completed in Rank
 - III. Candidate's Research, Scholarship and Creative Endeavors Statement
 - IV. Candidate's Research, Scholarship and Creative Endeavors Outlets Table
- G.11 Academic Advising, Counseling, and other Student Services
 - I. BC/EBC/EC Academic Advising, Counseling and Other Student Services Statement
 - II. Candidate's Academic Advising, Counseling and Other Student Services Statement
- G.12 Service
 - I. BC/EBC/EC Service Statement
 - II. Candidate's Service Statement

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

- G.13 Honors and Other Evidence of Merit or Recognition, including Contracts and Grants
 - I. BC/EBC/EC Honors and Grants Statement
 - II. Candidate's Honors and Grants Statement
- G.14 Reviewer Letters
 - I. Chart of Reviewers
 - II. Letters Received
- G.15 Additional Statements
- G.16 Supplemental Materials
 - I. Originals of all Students' Written Comments
 - II. Teaching Evaluations from Other Institutions (if applicable)
 - III. COVID-19 Professional Impact Statement
 - IV. Five Significant Works
 - V. Documentation Supporting the Status of Forthcoming Works
 - VI. Mid-Probationary Review (where relevant)
 - VII. Faculty Peer Teaching Observations
 - VIII. Sample Solicitation Letter Used for External Reviewers and List of Materials that were Sent for Evaluation
 - IX. Declinations (if applicable)
 - X. Letters Solicited from Collaborators
 - XI. Unsolicited Letters Received Prior to BC/EBC/EC Review (if applicable)
 - XII. Unsolicited Letters Received After BC/EBC/EC Committee Review (if applicable)
 - XIII. Other Supplemental Materials
 - XIV. Other Publications
 - XV. In-Progress or In-Preparation Works
 - XVI. Teaching Portfolio

Section H. OUTCOMES

- H.1 Presidential Conferences
- H.2 Announcement of Decisions
- H.3 Final Arguments in Terminal Appointment Pending Cases
- H.4 Request for Review by the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR)
- H.5 Reconsideration of a Promotion and Tenure Decision in the Terminal Year
- H.6 Grievances
- H.7 Resources
- H.8 HOP, Regents' Rules, State and Federal Law

Section A. OVERVIEW

A.1 Introduction

These General Promotion Guidelines describe the promotion process, preparation of materials, and management of candidate files for promotion of tenured and tenure-track faculty members at UT Austin, excluding faculty members at the Dell Medical School.

The goal of the promotion process is to provide a thorough and objective review of the substance and merits of each faculty member's case that is free from discrimination or bias. The review must be sufficient in its depth and character to support a decision that is in the best interest of the university, whatever the decision reached. The evaluation process comprises independent levels of review at multiple levels, as defined in Section A.2. The recommendations at each level should reflect the professional, evidence-based judgement of each faculty member and administrator and must not be positively or negatively influenced by the candidate's race, color, religion, national origin, sex (including pregnancy), age, disability, citizenship, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression.

A.2 Levels of Review

The number of levels of review are defined by the candidate's home school or college:

- In departmentalized schools and colleges, the candidate is evaluated at a minimum of five independent levels: (1) budget council, extended budget council, or executive committee for department (BC/EBC/EC), (2) department chair, (3) college/school advisory committee (CAC), (4) dean, and (5) central administration.
- In non-departmentalized schools and colleges, the candidate is evaluated at a minimum of three independent levels: (1) budget council, extended budget council, or executive committee for college/school (BC/EBC/EC), (2) dean, and (3) president's review committee.

Candidates with joint appointments must be reviewed simultaneously in the departments (as applicable) and colleges/schools corresponding to both the primary and joint appointments. (Section D.4)

The president of the University of Texas at Austin makes the final decision on promotion and tenure for all candidates. Tenure decisions are subsequently confirmed by the UT System Board of Regents.

A.3 Minimum Number of Voting Faculty Members for Promotion Review Committees

Review committees defined in Section A.2 (BC/EBC/EC and CAC) must contain a minimum of five eligible voters for each promotion case considered. For review of tenure-track candidates, eligible voters must hold tenured appointments. For review of tenured candidates, eligible voters must be full professors. A faculty member with a potential or real conflict of interest related to the candidate, as defined in Section D.5, is ineligible and must recuse themselves from the review, discussion, and vote on that candidate.

In cases where there are fewer than five eligible voting faculty members on the BC/EBC/EC or CAC, the dean must form an ad hoc promotion review committee that includes a minimum of five eligible voting members. The ad hoc review committee may include tenured faculty members from outside the candidate's home department and college/school, but the members should be familiar with the candidate's primary areas of research, scholarship, and/or creative activities.

This ad-hoc committee must be formed in the spring semester prior to the start of the promotion review process so that the ad hoc committee can fully participate and contribute to all aspects of the promotion review process (e.g., preliminary votes on whether the faculty candidate should be considered for promotion, external reviewer selection, etc.).

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

Note: It is possible that some steps in the promotion review process of a candidate for the 2022-23 promotion review cycle were completed before the 2022-23 guidelines were published in April 2022. Any promotion review steps that take place after the publication of these guidelines must involve the ad hoc promotion review committee with a minimum of five eligible voting members.

A.4 Areas of Faculty Performance Evaluated During the Promotion and Tenure Review

As described in the Handbook of Operating Procedures [\(HOP\) 2-2160](#), the candidate's contributions are evaluated in the following five areas:

- Teaching courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels and formal and/or informal supervision of students;
- Research, creative activities, and other scholarly efforts;
- Academic advising, counseling, and other student services;
- Administrative and committee service to the department, college, and university, and professional public service to the nation, state, and society; and
- Other evidence of merit or recognition, such as fellowships, grants, and special honors.

Recommendations for promotion and tenure are based on the candidate's demonstrated record of career accomplishments, with emphasis placed on accomplishments in rank and the trajectory of those contributions, as an indication of future performance.

A.5 Minimum Amount of Qualifying Service at UT Austin

All candidates for promotion and tenure must complete a minimum of two full years of qualifying service at UT Austin before the start of the academic year in which their promotion case is considered.

- For tenure-track faculty members, only years of probationary service are counted toward the minimum amount of qualifying service. (Section B.1)
- For tenured faculty members, only effective years in rank are counted toward the minimum amount of qualifying service. (Section C.1)

Note: The requirement for minimum years of service at UT Austin was defined for the first time in these 2022-23 guidelines, and some faculty members may have received offer letters in which shorter timeframes for promotion review were outlined. Deans should notify the Provost's Office as soon as possible of this situation if the faculty member is being considered for promotion during the 2022-23 academic year.

A.6 Elected Combined Service – Review Time Frame

For any candidate who has elected to combine service at UT Austin with time in the equivalent rank at prior institution(s), if the total of the combined service and additional years in the equivalent rank at the prior institution(s) is greater than the normative time for promotion then all levels of review must assess the candidate's record using two time frames. Reviewers (BC/EBC/EC, CAC, department chair, dean) should provide

- 1) a holistic review of the candidate's contributions and trajectory across the candidate's entire time in equivalent rank at UT Austin and the prior institution(s), and
- 2) an assessment of the candidate's most recent normative time period [with time at UT Austin plus the most recent time at the prior institution(s)].

The second time frame will provide more immediate evidence supporting future excellence. As an example, if the elected combined service includes review after three years of service at UT Austin with five years in the equivalent rank at a prior institution then the two time frames for review would include 1) the total of eight years and 2) the normative six-year period (three years at UT Austin and three years immediately prior). If the elected combined service time equals the normative time, then there is only a single time frame for review.

Section B. CRITERIA FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS

B.1 Years of Probationary Service at UT Austin

In accordance with [Regents' Rule 31007](#), a tenure-track faculty member accrues one year of probationary service at UT Austin for every nine months of full-time academic service during any academic year. An academic year does not count as a year of probationary service if the tenure-track faculty member: (1) begins employment at UT Austin after the start of the fall semester, (2) receives an approved extension to the probationary period, or (3) has been on leave without pay for any portion of the academic year.

- Faculty members appointed as a tenure-track assistant professor must be reviewed for promotion to tenured associate professor no later than their sixth year of probationary service.
- Faculty appointed as a tenure-track associate professor must be reviewed for appointment as a tenured associate professor or tenured full professor no later than their third year of probationary service at UT Austin.
- Faculty appointed as a tenure-track full professor must be reviewed for appointment as a tenured full professor no later than their third year of probationary service at UT Austin.
- Faculty appointed as a tenure-track instructor must be reviewed for appointment to tenure-track assistant professor no later than their third year of probationary service at UT Austin.

Candidates whose probationary period has been extended for personal circumstances under [HOP 2-2020](#), for other reasons as approved by the university, or due to leave without pay in accordance with university family and medical leave policies, shall be evaluated as if the accomplishments in rank were completed during the years of probationary service.

B.2 On-Time Promotion Review of Tenure-Track Assistant Professors

B.2a Maximum Number of Years of Probationary Service at UT Austin

Cases considered during the sixth year of probationary service at UT Austin are considered on-time reviews. These cases are also considered mandatory tenure reviews ("up-or-out").

B.2b Elected Combined Service at UT Austin and Other Institutions

In accordance with [HOP 2-2010](#), candidates who were appointed as a tenure-track assistant professor (or equivalent rank) at one or more other institutions immediately prior to their appointment as a tenure-track assistant professor at UT Austin may elect to combine years of probationary service at UT Austin with up to three full years of service at the other institution(s) to satisfy the requirements for on-time promotion.

In addition, the candidate must satisfy the following:

- The minimum required years of probationary service at UT Austin, as defined in Section A.5.
- At least three faculty peer teaching observations across at least two different academic years at UT Austin must be included in the dossier, as defined in Section G.8.

The candidate must inform their department chair (if applicable), dean's office, and the Provost's Office that they have elected to be considered under the combined service option no later than February 1 in the year immediately preceding the review. The candidate's record of combined service will be evaluated using the same expectations as if the candidate had completed six years of probationary service at UT Austin, and the case is considered a mandatory review ("up-or-out").

Note: The option for candidates to elect combined service was defined for the first time in these 2022-23 guidelines, which were published after the deadline of February 1. For the 2022-23 academic year, candidates must inform all levels no later than May 1, 2022.

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

B.2d Expectations for On-Time Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The granting of tenure has long-lasting consequences of great magnitude to the university and must be considered carefully. Promotion to the rank of tenured associate professor should be awarded only when the candidate has demonstrated clear evidence of the following:

- Impact, distinction and continuing potential in research, scholarship and/or creative endeavors; teaching; student advising and mentoring; service to the university and professional public service; and external recognition of accomplishments (i.e., awards and honors);
- A strong and reliable pipeline of excellence in research, scholarship, and/or creative endeavors that substantiates a continuing trajectory of impactful contributions throughout an extended career at UT Austin; and
- Research funding, in accordance with discipline norms, that predicts a sustainable trajectory of continued research excellence and financial support for students supervised by the candidate.

Awarding tenure must be in the best interest of the department, college/school, and university.

B.2e Decision Options for Mandatory Tenure Review

At each level of review defined in Section A.2, recommendation and the final decision options for mandatory tenure review are: (1) “promote to associate professor with tenure” or (2) “terminal appointment.”

B.3 Accelerated Promotion Review of Tenure-Track Assistant Professors

B.3a Years of Probationary or Combined Service

Cases considered before the sixth year of probationary service at UT Austin or the sixth year of elected combined service are considered accelerated reviews and are not considered mandatory reviews.

Candidates who

- wish to be considered for review, and
- who have accumulated six full academic years in rank at UT Austin or six years of elected combined service (including the academic year during which the review is being conducted), and
- have fewer than six years of probationary service by virtue of approved extensions to the probationary period,

are advised to rescind extensions to their probationary period and submit their case for on-time review, rather than accelerated review. (Years in which the candidate began employment at UT Austin after the start of the fall semester or was on leave without pay for any portion of the academic year do not count as years of probationary service, and these extensions to the probationary period cannot be rescinded.)

B.3b Expectations for Accelerated Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Accelerated cases must be fully explained and justified by the dean and chair (if applicable) and should only be put forward for review when a compelling case can be made that the candidate’s record is truly exceptional across all areas of contribution (Section A.4), the candidate exceeds expectations for on-time promotion in all areas (Section B.2d), and that accelerated promotion and tenure is in the university’s best interest.

In most cases, the university will benefit from the evidence gathered from fulfillment of the entire six years of probationary service or elected combined service prior to making a tenure decision because this information offers more consistent and reliable evidence to demonstrate a continuing trajectory of excellence in the professional context and environment of UT Austin.

B.3c Decision Options for Accelerated Review

At each level of review defined in Section A.2, recommendation and final decision options for accelerated review are: (1) “promote to associate professor with tenure,” (2) “do not promote,” or (3) “terminal appointment.” In the case of a “do not promote” decision by the president, the candidate must be reviewed

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

again in their sixth year of probationary service at UT Austin (B.2a) or sixth year of elected combined service (B.2b).

B.4 On-Time Promotion Review of Tenure-Track Associate and Full Professors

B.4a Maximum Number of Years of Probationary Service at UT Austin

Cases considered during the third year of probationary service at UT Austin are considered on-time reviews. These cases are also considered mandatory reviews (“up-or-out”). Accelerated reviews of faculty members in these titles are not permitted due to the university’s minimum years of service requirement (Section A.5).

B.4b Expectations for On-Time Promotion

While tenure-track associate and full professors have a shorter time in rank before mandatory tenure review compared with tenure-track assistant professors, the same criteria and expectations apply across areas of contribution (Section A.4 and Section B.2d). Emphasis is placed on demonstrating excellence in research, scholarship, and/or creative endeavors; organized and informal teaching; and student advising and mentoring at UT Austin.

Candidates whose probationary period has been extended for personal circumstances under [HOP 2-2020](#), for other reasons as approved by the university, or due to leave without pay in accordance with university family and medical leave policies, shall be evaluated as if the accomplishments in rank were completed during the years of probationary service.

B.4c Decision Options for Mandatory Review of Tenure-Track Associate Professors

At each level of review defined in Section A.2, recommendation and final decision options for mandatory review are: (1) “award tenure in rank of associate professor,” (2) “promote to professor with tenure,” or (3) “terminal appointment.”

B.4d Decision Options for Mandatory Review of Tenure-Track Full Professors

At each level of review defined in Section A.2, recommendation and final decision options for mandatory review are: (1) “award tenure in rank of professor” or (2) “terminal appointment.”

B.5 Instructors in a Probationary Status

Faculty members who do not complete their terminal degree prior to their faculty appointment at UT Austin may be appointed as a tenure-track instructor pending completion of the terminal degree.

Tenure-track instructors who complete their terminal degree during the first year of academic service do not require promotion review. Formal documentation should be submitted to the Provost’s Office and the title will be changed to tenure-track assistant professor effective September 1 of the subsequent academic year. Tenure-track instructors who complete their terminal degree in their second or third year of probationary service must be reviewed for promotion to tenure-track assistant professor at all levels, including the president.

All tenure-track instructors in their third year of probationary service must be reviewed, regardless of whether they have received their terminal degree.

At each level of review defined in Section A.2, recommendation and the final decision options are: (1) “promote to tenure-track assistant professor” or (2) “terminal appointment.” Years of service as a tenure-track instructor count toward years of probationary service as a tenure-track assistant professor.

Section C. CRITERIA FOR TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS

C.1 Effective Years in Rank at UT Austin

Tenured associate professors accrue one effective year of service in rank for every nine months of full-time academic service during any academic year. An academic year does not count as an effective year in rank if the tenured associate professor: (1) begins employment after the start of the fall semester, or (2) has an approved personal circumstances flag.

Years of probationary service as a tenure-track associate professor count toward the total number of effective years in rank for the promotion review of a tenured associate professor.

Candidates shall be evaluated as if the accomplishments in rank were completed during the number of effective years in rank.

C.2 On-Time Promotion Review of Tenured Associate Professors

C.2a Timing of Review for Tenured Associate Professors to Tenured Full Professors

The normative time in rank represents the typical number of effective years of service before an associate professor is promoted to professor and varies due to different expectations in individual disciplines (e.g., book fields might require a longer normative time in rank than paper fields). Cases considered during the sixth, seventh, or eighth effective year in rank at UT Austin are considered on-time reviews.

The BC/EBC/EC and department chair (or dean in a non-departmentalized school) are responsible for judging whether a tenured associate professor should be considered as a candidate for promotion using the norms of the field in terms of relevant standards of excellence across areas (Section A.4) and the field's definition of the normative (minimum of six years) time in rank.

C.2b Elected Combined Service at UT Austin and Other Institutions

Candidates who were appointed as a tenured associate professor (or equivalent rank) at one or more other institutions immediately prior to their appointment as a tenured associate professor at UT Austin may elect to combine effective years in rank at UT Austin with no more than three full years of service at the other institution(s) to satisfy the requirements for on-time promotion.

In addition, the candidate must satisfy the following:

- The minimum required years of effective years in rank at UT Austin, as defined in Section A.5.
- At least three faculty peer teaching observations across at least two different academic years at UT Austin must be included in the dossier, as defined in Section G.8.

The candidate must inform their department chair (if applicable), dean's office, and the Provost's Office that they have elected to be considered under the combined service option no later than February 1 in the year immediately preceding the review. The candidate's record of combined service will be evaluated using the same expectations as if the candidate had completed all effective years in at UT Austin.

Note: The option for candidates to elect combined service was defined for the first time in these 2022-23 guidelines, which were published after the deadline of February 1. For the 2022-23 academic year, candidates must inform all levels no later than May 1, 2022.

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

C.2d Expectations for On-Time Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Promotion to the rank of tenured full professor is based on the same criteria listed under Section B.2c for the awarding of tenure and require documented evidence of outstanding quality, impact, and potential for continuing excellence across areas of contribution (Section A.4). However, the standards, workload demands, and expectations are higher for the promotion to tenured full professor and include expectations about demonstrated leadership.

Promoting a faculty member to tenured full professor must be in the best interest of the department, college/school, and university.

C.3 Accelerated Promotion Review of Tenured Associate Professors

C.3a Years of Effective Years in Rank or Combined Service

Cases considered before the sixth effective year in rank at UT Austin or the sixth year of elected combined service are considered accelerated reviews.

Candidates who

- wish to be considered for review, and
- who have accumulated six full academic years in rank at UT Austin or six years of elected combined service (including the academic year during which the review is being conducted), and
- who have fewer than six effective years in rank due to personal circumstances flag(s)

are advised to rescind personal circumstances flag(s) and submit their case for on-time review, rather than accelerated review.

C.3b Expectations for Accelerated Promotion to Full Professor with Tenure

Accelerated cases must be fully explained and justified by the dean and chair (if applicable) and should only be put forward for review when a compelling case can be made that the candidate's record is truly exceptional across all areas of contribution (Section A.4), the candidate exceeds expectations for on-time promotion in all areas (Section C.2c), and that accelerated promotion is in the university's best interest.

In most cases, the university will benefit from the evidence gathered from fulfillment of the entire six effective years in or elected combined service prior to making a decision because this information offers more consistent and reliable evidence to demonstrate a continuing trajectory of excellence in the professional context and environment of UT Austin.

C.4 Tenured Associate Professors Invoking the Right to Review

In accordance with [HOP 2-2160](#), a faculty member in the rank of tenured associate professor can invoke their right to be considered for promotion to tenured full professor during the tenth or later effective year in rank.

To invoke this right of consideration, the tenured associate professor must advise the department chair (or dean in non-departmentalized schools/colleges) by February 1st of the academic year preceding the review year. Exceptions to the deadline can be made in consultation with and after approval by the Provost's Office.

The case shall be reviewed for promotion at all levels, including the president. In the case of a denied promotion, the candidate may invoke the right of consideration after five or more additional effective years in rank unless the BC/EBC/EC and department chair determine that an earlier review is appropriate.

Note: The option for candidates to elect combined service was defined more explicitly for the first time in these 2022-23 guidelines, which were published after the deadline of February 1. For the 2022-23 academic year, candidates must inform all levels no later than May 1, 2022.

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

C.5 Expectations for Promotion for Tenured Faculty with Extended Time in Rank

Candidates may experience professional slowdowns, reductions in excellence, or overly variable patterns in terms of productivity, performance, and trajectory while serving in rank as a tenured associate professor for a variety of reasons. If a candidate has accumulated more effective years of service than the normative period relevant to their discipline (Section C.2a), the candidate's record during the entire time in rank is considered, but emphasis is placed on accomplishments during the normative timeframe immediately preceding the review. The contributions, performance, and trajectory built during the recent normative timeframe must meet the criteria of excellence across areas of contribution (Section A.4) necessary to support promotion.

C.6 Decision Options for Review of Tenured Associate Professors

At each level of review defined in Section A.2, recommendation and final decision options for review from tenured associate professor to tenured full professor are: (1) "promote to professor with tenure," or (2) "do not promote."

Section D. DEPARTMENT CHAIR AND DEAN RESPONSIBILITIES

D.1 Familiarity with Written Guidelines

Candidates and all internal reviewers (including deans, CAC members, department chairs, and BC/EBC/EC members) must familiarize themselves with these guidelines and any other written guidelines provided by the department and/or CSU.

D.2 Unbiased Review

The reviews and recommendations at each level must not be positively or negatively influenced by a candidate's race, color, religion, national origin, sex (including pregnancy), age, disability, citizenship, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression. Department chairs and deans should consult with the Provost's Office if any internal or external reviewer expresses a favorable or unfavorable recommendation that could have the appearance of being influenced by any of these immutable characteristics (e.g., a reviewer recommends promotion to increase the diversity among the faculty).

D.3 Additional College/School Guidelines

Because variation in requirements is possible among disciplines and departments, a dean may distribute additional procedural guidelines and information for preparation of candidate dossiers within their college or school. This information must be disseminated to the college or school faculty (including promotion candidates) and shared with the Provost's Office. These University of Texas at Austin guidelines, the HOP, Regents' Rules, applicable state and federal laws take precedence over CSU guidelines.

D.4 Managing Joint Appointments

Faculty members with joint appointments must be simultaneously reviewed in both the primary and joint department or college/school. The respective department chairs and deans are responsible for identifying the need for review, coordinating the reviews, and overseeing the independent reviews to completion. The department chair (or dean in a non-departmentalized college/school) corresponding to the candidate's primary appointment is responsible for notifying the department chair(s)/dean(s) corresponding to the candidate's joint appointment(s) of the review and coordinating the selection and solicitation of external reviewers with joint units (including feedback from the candidate as described in Section D.9 and Section E.4).

The units must conduct independent reviews of the candidate, which should entail evaluation of the same dossier contents. For joint appointments in departments within the same college/school, independent reviews are conducted by each department followed by review by the CAC and dean. For joint appointments in different colleges/schools, independent reviews are conducted at the department (where relevant), college/school, and deans' levels. Deans must make independent recommendations regarding promotion and tenure of the candidate.

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

The president will make a decision about promotion/tenure for the candidate using all of the information provided.

D.5 Conflict of Interest

Any faculty member, department chair, or dean involved in the promotion review (Section A.2) with a real or potential conflict of interest related to a candidate (e.g., spouse, partner, Ph.D. advisor, etc.) must recuse themselves from the review, discussion, and vote on that candidate. In addition, the following individuals are considered to have conflicts of interest for promotion/tenure reviews and must recuse themselves from participation in the review:

- Any faculty member, department chair, or dean who made a complaint against the candidate that led to a finding of a policy violation.
- Any faculty member, department chair, or dean against whom the candidate made a complaint that led to a finding of a policy violation.

D.6 Eligibility to Serve as Department Chair for a Promotion Review

Individuals serving as department chair for a candidate's promotion review must be free from conflict of interest and eligible to vote on the promotion case as defined in Section D.5. In situations in which a department chair is ineligible to serve, the dean in consultation with the Provost's Office will designate a faculty member to serve as the department chair designee for the candidate's review. The department chair designee is authorized to act in the place of the department chair with respect to the actions authorized by these guidelines and should be designated prior to the start of the promotion review process or immediately after the confirmation of a conflict of interest.

D.7 Eligibility to Serve as Dean for a Promotion Review

Individuals serving as dean role for a candidate's promotion review must be free from conflict of interest and eligible to vote on the promotion case as defined in Section D.5. In situations in which a dean is ineligible to serve, the Provost's Office will designate a faculty member to serve as the dean designee for the candidate's review. The dean designee is authorized to act in the place of the dean with respect to the actions authorized by these guidelines and should be designated prior to the start of the promotion review process or immediately after the confirmation of a conflict of interest.

D.8 Candidate Meetings

The department chair or dean must meet with each candidate in the spring semester prior to the promotion review to address the following items:

- Explain the promotion review process to the candidate.
- Advise the candidate to become familiar with these Guidelines and any additional CSU-specific guidelines.
- Discuss responsibilities for compiling dossier contents.
- Discuss candidate access to the dossier materials as described in these Guidelines.

D.9 Selecting Reviewers

The department chair and/or dean are responsible for finalizing a list of arm's length reviewers for each candidate from lists compiled separately by the candidate and the BC/EAC/EC. External reviewers must satisfy the following criteria:

- Recognized experts at peer or aspirational peer institutions knowledgeable about the scholarly expectations for promotion.
- Tenured full professors.
- Reviewers must have no real or potential conflict of interest related to the candidate (e.g., spouse, partner, Ph.D. advisor, etc. and see Section D.5)

Any deviations from these considerations (e.g., reviewer from a non-peer institution, emeritus professor, etc.) must be thoroughly explained in the [Chart of Reviewers](#).

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

All candidates must be given at least two business days to review the list of reviewers and then the dean must approve the final list of reviewers before the solicitation letters are sent. The majority of the received review letters should be from reviewers nominated solely by the department or college/school.

D.10 List of Review Committee Members

The department chair/dean shall compile a list of all members of the review committees at the department and/or college/school levels and provide the candidate at least two business days to identify potential conflicts of interest (Section D.5). The potential conflicts of interest should be shared with, and resolved by, the dean before the promotion review begins.

D.11 Participation in Deliberations

Department chairs and deans must be present for review committee discussions of each case as indicated below, but do not vote.

- Department chairs must be present for the BC/EBC/EC discussions.
- Deans in non-departmentalized colleges/schools must be present for the BC/EBC/EC discussions.
- Deans in departmentalized colleges/schools must be present for CAC discussions.

Department chairs and deans must each provide an independent assessment of the candidate's contributions and their recommended decisions about promotion and must also include a description of the relevant committee's discussion in their respective statements.

Section E. CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES

E.1 Dossier Preparation

Candidates should familiarize themselves with these guidelines and any other related written guidelines provided by the department and/or school/college and consult with the department chair and/or dean about the relative responsibilities for compiling the required information. Candidates have the discretion to include any additional materials that they believe are relevant to the promotion or tenure decision (Section G.16.XIII).

Candidates with joint appointments should prepare a single dossier for review by the units in which they are jointly appointed (Section D.4).

E.2 Candidate Meeting with Supervisor

Candidates are responsible for arranging to meet with their supervisor (department chair, dean) in the spring semester prior to the promotion review to ensure that the candidate understands

- The promotion review process,
- The candidate's responsibilities in terms of compiling their own dossier,
- The importance of reviewing the university's promotion and tenure Guidelines and any additional CSU-specific promotion and tenure guidelines,
- The candidate's rights about how to access dossier materials (as also described in these Guidelines).

E.3 List of Review Committee Members and Supervisors

The candidate shall review the list of review committee members including BC/EBC/EC and CAC (if applicable) in order to identify potential conflicts of interest (COIs). The potential COIs should be expressed to, and resolved by, the dean before promotion review begins. Similarly, if the candidate perceives potential COIs with their department chair or dean, those COIs should be shared with the relevant supervisor (i.e., shared with the dean for the department chair COI, and with the [Provost's Office](#) for a dean COI). In all cases, decisions about whether the individual with the potential COI should be recused from review will be made before review begins. The candidate may place a statement in the Additional Statements folder (Section G.15) to document any COI concerns about internal reviewers.

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

Note: Because these 2022-23 Guidelines are published in April 2022, it is possible that some steps in the promotion review process might already be completed for the 2022-23 promotion review cycle. Any COIs identified after publication of these Guidelines need to be handled promptly and as described above.

E.4 List of Promotion Reviewers

The candidate shall provide the department, college, or school with a list of recommended individuals who satisfy the criteria in Section D.9 to provide evaluative review letters for the promotion dossier.

The candidate shall review the list of individuals selected prior to the solicitation letter being sent out by the chair or dean. Concerns about any reviewers on the list may be expressed to the department chair (or dean) by the candidate before the stated deadline (a minimum of two full business days after receiving the list of reviewers' names). Then the dean must approve the final list of reviewers before the solicitation letters are sent. The candidate may place a statement in the Additional Statements folder (Section G.15) to document any concerns about the reviewers selected.

E.5 Candidate's Review of Dossier

The candidate must [check](#) the materials in the promotion dossier before the BC/EBC/EC considers a case. The purpose of this review is to ensure that the candidate materials are included in the dossier as submitted by the candidate. If the candidate believes that the file is incomplete or includes incorrect material, or if the candidate has any other objection to the content or process, the department chair or dean shall either correct the problem or include a statement in the file about the problem and why it was not addressed as the candidate requested. The candidate may also place a statement in the Additional Statements folder (Section G.15) about the concern or other aspects of the case.

Section F. UNIVERSITY OBLIGATIONS

F.1 Access to Promotion File Materials

Under state law, the university may not keep the contents of the promotion file confidential. A candidate may request and be allowed to inspect any material in the promotion dossier at any time during the promotion process.

F.1a Informal Access

At any point in the process, a candidate may request to review the contents of their dossier. Requests to review a file are to be addressed to the department chair, dean, or provost, as appropriate. The candidate will be allowed to review the contents of the promotion file within three business days with adequate supervision. Copying or photographing materials is not permitted, and no materials may be removed from the promotion file.

F.1b Formal Access

Candidates may request copies of any materials in the file at any time in the process by writing to the Provost's Office at evpp-aps@utexas.edu.

F.2 COVID-19 Professional Impact

The university recognizes that the COVID-19 pandemic has introduced some professional challenges to the work of our faculty beginning in spring 2020 through spring 2022 semesters. In the relevant dossier statements (research, teaching, service, advising, honors), faculty can document the direct impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on their professional workload and opportunities (e.g., lab closures, global supply chain disruptions, inability to travel for work, slowed book presses, etc.) as well as the ultimate impact on faculty productivity, performance and trajectory. Alternatively, or in addition, any faculty member may include a COVID-19 Professional Impact

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

Statement in the dossier (Section G.16.XIII). All levels of review should use this information to help contextualize faculty records and consider these professional impacts when reviewing faculty work.

Note: Personal impacts cannot influence faculty review in any way other than designating time that has been flagged as being officially impacted by personal circumstances and that will then be excluded from the review. For example, candidates with a Personal Circumstances Flag shall be evaluated as if the work were done in the period of service that excludes that year (or years).

F.3 Additions to the Dossier

All information referenced in the curriculum vitae (i.e., papers, books, research grants, performances, etc.) is considered to be included in the dossier by reference.

If information is added to the promotion dossier after the candidate's file check, the information must be date-stamped and placed in a separate folder labeled Additional Statements (Section G.15). The candidate shall be informed of the addition to the dossier and permitted an opportunity to place a statement in the dossier addressing this addition. All administrative parties who have already reviewed the dossier will also be notified of the inclusion of additional materials. (Notification is not necessary for the addition of required statements described later in these guidelines.)

F.4 Issues Beyond the Scope of the Promotion and Tenure Process

In rare cases, a tenure or promotion review may raise issues that the tenure and promotion process is not well suited to resolve. For example, an accusation about academic integrity may be relevant to a decision about tenure or promotion, but may be difficult to resolve adequately within the tenure and promotion process. In such cases, the chair or dean, in consultation with the provost and president, may delay the tenure and promotion review process until the matter is resolved by an appropriate investigative body separate from the tenure and promotion process.

F.5 Progression of Promotion Review Cases through Levels of Review

As stated in the [Chart of Recommended Actions](#), the following rules apply to the progression of cases:

- Mandatory tenure review cases, e.g., "up or out", and tenured associate professors who have invoked the right of consideration must progress through all levels of review, unless the candidate resigns from the university.
- Reconsideration of tenure-track cases in a terminal year do not progress beyond the department's level of review unless recommended for promotion by the BC/EBC/EC. If recommended by the BC/EBC/EC, the case progresses through all levels of review, unless withdrawn by the candidate prior to the president's review or if the candidate resigns from the university.
- All other promotion review cases progress through all levels of review unless the candidate either (1) withdraws the case prior to the president's review or (2) resigns from the university.

Section G. PROMOTION DOSSIERS

Dossiers must be assembled in the following order and with the specified supporting documentation. If a college or school requires additional documentation (e.g., candidate and BC/EBC/EC statement on Contributions to Diversity, Equity and Inclusivity) then the guidelines for the additional materials must be provided to faculty candidates and to the Provost's Office.

G.1 Change of Rank Form and Voting

All votes and recommendations are recorded on the Recommendation for Change in Academic Rank/Status form that is provided by the Provost's Office. Voting choices for eligible voters include "yes" or "no" for the promotion and tenure decision. Eligible voters cannot "abstain." Committee members must vote after the evidence is compiled and reviewed, not before, and repeated voting to achieve unanimity is not allowed.

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

Faculty members may not vote on any matters affecting promotion from their own rank or higher ranks, regardless of tenure status. For review of tenure-track assistant professors, eligible voters must hold tenured appointments. For review of tenured and tenure-track associate professors and tenure-track professors, eligible voters must be full professors.

The total number of ineligible members of the relevant committee should be recorded in the provided space on the Change of Rank form and should not be counted as absent. The count of absent eligible voters must be recorded although that count should not include a tally of any ineligible members who are absent.

G.2 Dean Statement

The dean statement should not duplicate information found in the chair's statement. This statement must contain the following (in no particular order):

- A summary of the CAC's discussion; explanation of the rationale for the committee's vote and resulting recommendation; explanation of negative votes (the dean should seek out feedback from the committee when negative vote(s) are cast to fully contextualize the negative vote(s) in their statement). Deans are encouraged to characterize the strength of the CAC's recommendations in each of the areas of contribution (Section A.4) and overall.
- Explanation for timing of promotion review (e.g., mandatory reviews, accelerated reviews, candidate invoked right of consideration, etc.) and provide justifications for accelerated reviews and candidates with extended time in rank (see section A.6).
- Independent assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
- Summarize the prestige/quality of the scholarly and creative outlets (e.g., journal, book press, venue, gallery, etc.).
- Explicit contextualization and assessment of the candidate's scholarly trajectory and its sustainability based on the candidate's demonstrated productivity, current and future funding (where relevant) and in-progress and in-preparation works (contained in Supplemental Materials).
- Reflect on the reviewers' letters. Identify and justify letters that do not satisfy the criteria in Section D.9. Do not extensively quote the reviewers' letters.
- Clearly stated recommendations about promotion decisions must be recorded on the change of rank form. Deans are encouraged to describe the strength of their recommendation (e.g., strongly recommend, recommend, etc.).
- In non-departmentalized colleges and schools the dean must provide the additional information required in the department chair statement.

G.3 Department Chair Statement (applicable for departmentalized colleges)

This statement must contain the following (in no particular order):

- A summary of the BC/EBC/EC's discussion; explanation of the rationale for the committee's vote and resulting recommendation; explanation of negative votes (the department chair should seek out feedback from the committee when negative vote(s) are cast in order to fully contextualize the negative vote(s) in their statement). Chairs are encouraged to characterize the strength of the BC/EBC/EC's recommendations in each of the areas of contribution (Section A.4) and overall.
- Brief explanation of the candidate's education credentials if either the terminal degree is outside of the department's discipline or if the candidate does not have the discipline's terminal degree.
- Description of the candidate's scholarly contributions framed using and relative to the standards of excellence in the discipline and couched in the relevant timeframes as described in Section A.6.
- Comment on the prestige/quality of the scholarly and creative outlets (e.g., journal, book press, venue, gallery, etc.).
- Explicit contextualization and assessment of the candidate's scholarly trajectory based on their demonstrated productivity, current and future funding (where relevant), and in-progress and in-preparation works.

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

- Explanation for accelerated review (if applicable).
- Reflection on the mid-probationary review (applicable for tenure-track assistant professor candidates only). If the written review is not included nor available, that must be justified.
- Reflect on the statements prepared by the BC/EBC/EC.
- Independent assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
- Information about the significance of the candidate's field to the strategic priorities of the department/college.
- Clearly stated recommendations about promotion decisions will be recorded on the change of rank form. Chairs are encouraged to describe the strength of their recommendation (e.g., strongly recommend, recommend, etc.).

G.4 Other Statements (if applicable)

Additional statements describing candidate contributions may be provided by unit heads in a variety of circumstances including but not limited to the following examples:

- When a faculty member holds a courtesy position and has significant involvement in another department or center.
- When a faculty member is significantly engaged in the unit's activities but does not hold a courtesy position.
- Research faculty affiliated with a bureau, academic/research center, laboratory, institute, etc.

G.5 Curriculum Vitae (CV)

Each CSU is strongly encouraged to create a template including all required components for their promotion candidates to use to help standardize presentation of material.

Templates must include the elements listed below and in CSUs that do not offer templates the candidate must provide a CV with the following minimum elements:

- All degrees, fields of study, dates awarded
- Names of any advisors including post-doctoral advisor(s)
 - Throughout the CV, any advisor's name must be highlighted
- Titles of candidate's dissertation/theses
- Professional registrations, licensures, certifications
- All academic employment and/or appointments including funding amounts and dates of affiliation
- Complete record of publications/scholarship/creative work categorized by type, including:
 - Publications and other evidence of scholarship/creativity listed according to the kind of entry (e.g., books, chapters, articles, reports, proceedings, performances, and other materials)
 - Identification of refereed works
 - Names of co-authors listed in the order they appear in the publication
 - Clear designation of the candidate's role if it is not author (e.g., editor, translator, etc.)
 - Works that are forthcoming should be clearly labeled as such (e.g., accepted, in press) with relevant documentation included in the Documentation Supporting the Status of Forthcoming Works folder in the Supplemental Materials folder (Section G.16.V).
 - Other works in progress that are in preparation, submitted, under review, etc. should be clearly labeled
 - Beginning and ending page numbers for articles (or total number of pages if page numbers are not available) and total number of pages for books and book chapters
 - Only number research, scholarly or creative works completed in current rank
 - Scholarly presentations or creative performances/exhibitions
 - Acceptance rates where relevant (e.g., conference proceedings)
- Each CSU can offer a template for the reporting of funding in their faculty candidates' CVs. For candidates whose CSUs do not offer a funding template then the following structure could be used. The funding

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

section of CV might use the following five *Funding Categories and Roles* as separate subheadings. Projects falling within each category can be grouped by *Funding Status* (Current, Under Review, or Completed). And the nine *Information Fields* listed below can be reported for each project. Candidates can list funding from any source, including but not limited to: federal grants and contracts, state grants and contracts, industry sponsored research, foundation grants or fellowships, support from foreign entities, and internal research awards. The five Funding Categories include:

- 1) *Sponsored Research Funding – Candidate PI / co-PI / co-I* with project entered into the university's Research Management System (RMS)
- 2) *Sponsored Research Funding – Candidate in Key Personnel Role* (i.e., other than PI / co-PI / co-I)
- 3) *Gifts* (recorded in the VIP database) *and Other External Research Awards or Contracts*
- 4) *Internal Research Funding – Candidate PI / co-PI / co-I*
- 5) *Internal Research Funding – Candidate in Key Personnel Role* (i.e., other than PI / co-PI / co-I)

Below are the eight *Information Fields* that could be reported for each project that is reported in the relevant *Funding Categories and Roles* section:

- i) Sponsor name
 - ii) Name and Affiliation of the Principal Investigator
 - iii) Role of the Candidate (PI, co-PI, or co-I only)
 - iv) Project Title
 - v) Project/funding period
 - vi) Co-PIs, affiliation, and relative effort of each
 - vii) Funding amount under candidate's supervision
 - viii) For project proposals under review, an indication of the current status
- Research funding associated with external academic employment
 - Patents issued and patents filed while in rank
 - All advising and related student service including current placement of former graduate students
 - Administrative and committee service, and academic-related professional and public service with dates
 - Other evidence of merit or recognition

Do not duplicate sections from the CV in other parts of the dossier unless specified in these guidelines.

G.6 Teaching Statements

III. BC/EBC/EC Teaching Statement

The BC/EBC/EC must provide a separate document that includes the signatures (electronic or by hand) and typed names of those responsible for preparing it. This document should assess the candidate's contributions to undergraduate and graduate student and postdoctoral fellow learning (e.g., through organized courses, independent studies, membership and supervision of examination, thesis and dissertation committees, etc.). The Teaching statement is required for all candidates. The assessment should:

- Identify areas of distinction as well as potential weaknesses in performance, contributions and trajectory.
- For any faculty candidate who is shorter in rank at UT Austin than normative for the promotion (e.g., accelerated or elected combined service cases), the time spent teaching organized courses and working with UT Austin students is shorter and thus there is less evidence available about candidates' teaching excellence at UT Austin. Thus, it is critical that in their assessment, the BC/EBC/EC recognizes the shorter time spent teaching students in the context of UT Austin and evaluates the extent to which the candidate has already exhibited consistency in their teaching excellence within that shorter time frame.

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

- Discuss both student course instructor survey results (including both ratings and student comments) and peer observation reports and link to candidate’s record of teaching quality.
- Assess relevant evidence of merit or recognition for teaching innovation and excellence.
- Reflect familiarity with the candidate’s teaching portfolio.
- Discuss the candidate’s willingness to teach courses for which there is need and strong student demand (where relevant).
- Contextualize the balance between undergraduate and graduate teaching, as applicable.
- Describe the candidate’s membership and supervision of undergraduate and graduate student examination, thesis, and dissertation committees and supervision of postdoctoral fellows (if applicable). Contextualize program and department expectations around these contributions.
- Describe the candidate’s contributions in terms of supporting independent studies (e.g., individual instruction) or other informal learning opportunities.
- Describe organized service-learning instruction (if applicable).
- Consider any special circumstances concerning the faculty member’s teaching performance, including any innovative contributions.
- Describe contributions to instructional activities involving UT Austin students conducted by the candidate that are outside of the regular workload (e.g., Option III program courses).
- Assessment of teaching and advising from spring 2020 through (and including) spring 2022 must include consideration that the COVID-19 pandemic led to all teaching faculty needing to handle the challenge of moving instruction online for entire semesters and parts of semesters across those two calendar years.
 - CSUs that incorporate assessment of grade inflation indices should keep in mind the more flexible pass/fail options offered during all 2020 (calendar year) semesters.

IV. Candidate’s Teaching Statement

The candidate must provide (using four pages or fewer) a personal statement of teaching philosophy, educational goals for the courses and students taught and supervised (both formally and informally) and how those goals were accomplished, description of any innovation or unique methods used, self-reflection about and changes implemented to address instructional and supervising challenges, discussion of demonstrated improvement, and presentation of other materials to facilitate teaching evaluation.

G.7 Course Instructor Surveys (CIS)

III. Report of Course Rating Averages

Each department or college should prepare a report of course rating averages using the Provost’s Office [template](#). Classes should be grouped by course and listed within course group in chronological order from earliest to latest. The level and type of each course, class enrollment size, number and percent of CIS responses, CIS instructor rating, and CIS course rating should be provided for each class taught.

IV. Summary of Course Instructor Survey Results

Each department or college/school will need to download a Summary of Recent Course-Instructor Survey Results through the summer 2022 term for each promotion candidate. This download is available in the university’s [Faculty Information System](#). The summary will be based on all CIS forms (including Option III and summer) and will include the applicable period for each candidate as defined below:

Candidates for tenure and for instructor’s promotion to tenure-track assistant professor:	Entire probationary period at UT Austin
All other candidates:	Time in rank at UT Austin or six years – whichever is smaller

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

If the dean chooses not to use this downloaded summary, or candidates did not use the basic or expanded CIS form, then the dean is responsible for developing a format for college-wide use.

G.8 List of Peer Teaching Observers

A chart listing the faculty peer teaching observations using the [university template](#) should be included in the dossier with the actual peer observation materials being saved in the Supplementary Materials folder (Section G.16.VII).

A minimum of three faculty peer observations of classes at UT Austin is required during the candidate's time in rank, ideally in the same classes over the course of multiple semesters in order to provide a longitudinal perspective. Faculty peer observations must take place during at least two different academic years (at a minimum). Candidates who do not have three faculty peer observations in rank at UT Austin across at least two different academic years must wait to seek promotion until that criterion is met.

Faculty should routinely be observed by faculty colleagues in their organized courses. Faculty peer teaching observation reports should record observations by faculty of the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher at the graduate and/or undergraduate levels. The reports should cover such elements as presentation, course content, organization, clarity of written materials, rigor and fairness of written examinations, appropriateness of methodology, student outcomes, etc. Course instructor survey student comments from prior semesters' organized courses should also be reviewed and summarized as part of the observation process. The observation record should also document information describing formal and informal student-faculty interactions and supervision.

Particular attention should be paid to constructive advice offered during earlier peer observations and capturing candidate's progress and responsiveness, then following up with specific progress reports in subsequent semesters observing the same course, where possible.

Include in the Supplementary Materials folder all reports of faculty peer observations conducted while in rank including reports by faculty observers and self-reflection by the candidate. Observation reports for the fall semester during which the candidate is being reviewed for promotion (i.e., fall 2022) should not be used unless absolutely necessary (and explained). Note that peer observations conducted from spring 2020 through spring 2022 should be considered in light of the professional impacts of COVID-19.

Each peer observation report must be written by the faculty peer observer and is to include:

- Number and title of observed course(s)
- Date of report(s)
- Date of classroom observation(s)
- Description of methods by which instructor engages students in learning
- Date on which the observation(s) was discussed with the candidate
- Constructive advice
- Candidate's responsiveness and any specific improvement(s) linked to previous peer observation reports
- Name and signature of observer(s)
- Review of course instructor survey ratings and student comments for courses taught while in rank
- Assessment of candidate's contributions and trajectory in terms of formal and informal student supervision and advising

G.9 Graduate Students and Postdocs

III. Committee Report of Masters and Doctoral Theses

The Provost's Office will distribute this report to the deans and department chairs in early September for inclusion in the dossier of each promotion candidate.

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

IV. Postdoctoral Fellows Supervised

Provide a list of postdoctoral fellows supervised with name, institution awarding the Ph.D., and date conferred.

G.10 Research, Scholarship, and Creative Endeavors

V. BC/EBC/EC Research, Scholarship, and Creative Endeavors Statement

The BC/EBC/EC must provide a separate document assessing the candidate's research contributions and trajectory. This statement must include the typed names and signatures (electronic or by hand) of the members responsible for preparing the statement. The Research, Scholarship, and Creative Endeavors statement should:

- Describe which area(s) of the field is the focus of the faculty member's work.
- Briefly describe how the candidate's research contributes to their field and explain it in a way that is accessible to those outside of their field.
- For candidates who have elected combined service at UT Austin with time in the equivalent rank at prior institution(s), the BC/EC/EBC should be sure to use Section A.6 to form the timeframe(s) that contextualizes their review.
- Identify areas of distinction and potential weaknesses in the contributions while in rank and couched in the standards of the field.
- Describe how the committee evaluators conducted their review.
- Be clear about the norms of the field and indicate, for example, the quality of the outlets for a candidate's work (i.e. journals, galleries, venues, etc.).
- Comment on the quality of the press and/or press book series, when applicable.
- Explain the norms of co-authorship (e.g., first author has contributed the most, etc.), where applicable, and whether peer review was involved.
- Comment on the contribution or role of the candidate for works with large numbers of co-authors.
- Explain, where applicable, reasons for counting non-traditional outlets favorably.
- For tenure-track candidates,
 - Assess the level of independent research activity while in rank.
 - For any book publications, indicate whether the book is derived from the doctoral dissertation, and, if so, to what extent it has been expanded or modified.
- For tenured candidates,
 - Assess the level of independence and leadership while in rank in completed and ongoing research activity.
 - Define the normative time (no less than six years) in rank given the candidate's discipline. (For example, in book fields, the Normative Time in Rank might be longer.)
 - If the candidate has been in the tenured associate professor rank longer than the normative period relevant to their discipline, then the committee must assess the candidate's research record using two time frames. The committee should provide a holistic review of the candidate's research contributions and trajectory across the candidate's entire effective time in rank while also providing an assessment of the candidate's most recent Normative Time in Rank as a tenured associate professor with the latter providing the more immediate evidence supporting future excellence.
- For any book publication, the committee should clarify whether works have been accepted by the publisher and are irreversibly "in production" (meaning that the work is complete and no further edits can be contributed by the author).
 - Similarly, it should be clear whether articles and book chapters are "in press" or "forthcoming" where "forthcoming" means that the article or book chapter has been accepted for publication and requires no further revisions.

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

- Assess the evidence of a strong and reasonable pipeline of in-progress scholarly and creative works and (where necessary) funding that predicts a sustainable trajectory of continued and future scholarly excellence.

VI. List of Five Most Significant Works Completed in Rank

The candidate must select the five most significant works completed while in their current rank and that were not considered published or forthcoming in a previous promotion decision. For tenured faculty candidates, the five significant works should include work from the recent normative timeframe preceding the review. These five most significant works must be distributed to the external reviewers for review. A listing of the five significant works (using the [university template](#)) must be provided in the research section of the dossier. For each of the five most significant works, the candidate should include the following information in the listing for any work that is co-authored:

- The names of co-authors who were in a student or other trainee status (e.g., post doc) at the time of submission must be italicized.
- The names of co-authors who were previously advisors must be in highlighted.
- Indicate who the co-authors are and their status at the time of submission [e.g., current or former student, post doc, peer faculty (i.e., of same rank), senior faculty, etc.].
- Include a brief qualitative statement of the candidate's contribution.

VII. Candidate's Research, Scholarship and Creative Endeavors Statement

The candidate must provide (in four pages or fewer) a statement of accomplishments, goals, and future plans in the area of research, scholarship, and creative endeavors. Candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointment in rank (which may include work in rank at another institution), and should articulate a plan for continued, future development of their research, scholarship and creative endeavors program and trajectory.

VIII. Candidate's Research, Scholarship and Creative Endeavors Outlets Table

The candidate must complete a table that contextualizes the caliber of the outlets (e.g., press, journal, conference, exhibition space, performance venue, etc.) in which their research, scholarship and creative endeavors have appeared. This contextualization can include a description of the ranking of the impact of the outlet, acceptance rates, or other measures (if available) to help describe the outlet's quality.

CSUs might require use of their own template. In the absence of a required CSU template, candidates may choose their own formatting and/or the university's generic [template](#) may be used or modified.

G.11 Academic Advising, Counseling, and other Student Services

III. BC/EBC/EC Academic Advising, Counseling and Other Student Services Statement

The BC/EBC/EC must provide a separate document assessing the candidate's performance, contributions and trajectory with respect to advising in an Academic Advising, Counseling and other Student Services statement. The statement must include the typed names and signatures (electronic or by hand) of the members responsible for preparing the statement. The BC/EBC/EC statement is required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

IV. Candidate's Academic Advising, Counseling and Other Student Services Statement

The candidate must provide (in two pages or fewer) an Academic Advising, Counseling and other Student Services statement describing their contributions, performance and trajectory for relevant activities. The Academic Advising, Counseling, and other Student Services statements should describe and assess performance, contributions and trajectory for both the undergraduate and/or graduate levels during the candidate's time in rank. Examples of items that are considered a part of "Academic Advising, Counseling, and other Student Services" include, for example:

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

- How the candidate has assisted in course advising for undergraduate and/or graduate students.
- Service as undergraduate advisor or graduate advisor
- Advising majors for registration.
- Orientation activities for new students.
- Offering advice to students considering advanced degrees.
- Offering students help with internships and job placement.
- Advising student organizations.
- Student recruitment and retention activities.

Note that information about service as a dissertation, thesis or report (etc.) faculty “advisor” (supervisor) and membership on associated committees should be captured as a part of the faculty candidate’s contributions to teaching in the dossier (e.g., in Teaching statement, peer observations, BC/EBC/EC review of Teaching statements, etc.) not in the Academic Advising, Counseling and Other Student Services statements.

G.12 Service

Service statements should describe and assess candidate’s contributions to their academic program, department, CSU, university, state, nation, discipline, and community during their time in rank.

III. BC/EBC/EC Service Statement

In the Service statement, the BC/EBC/EC must assess the quality of the candidate’s performance, contributions and trajectory with respect to service while contextualizing expectations for the candidate’s rank and discipline. The statement must include the typed names and signatures (electronic or by hand) of the members responsible for preparing the statement. The BC/EBC/EC statement is required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

For candidates who have elected combined Service at UT Austin with time in the equivalent rank at prior institution(s), the BC/EC/EBC should be sure to use Section A.6 to form the timeframe(s) that contextualizes their review.

The statement should explain the prestige and significance of any organization membership and leadership positions held. The following categories of service can be considered:

- Administrative and Committee Service. Positions of leadership, such as chairing a committee, are to be noted in particular.
- Academic and Professionally Related Public Service. Service in scholarly or professional organizations, in particular, and its significance should be noted, for example, whether an editorship is of a highly respected refereed journal, or whether an elected office is in a significant scholarly organization. A distinction is to be made between editorship of a journal and membership on a large editorial board.
- Community-Engaged Service. Significant contributions in terms of community-engaged service including, for example, OpEd publications can also be described and explained in this section.
- Practice- and Discipline-Engaged Activities. Activities connecting faculty with their practice and discipline should be described.

Note that information about “service” as a dissertation, thesis or report (etc.) faculty advisor (supervisor, chair, co-chair) and membership on associated committees should be considered a contribution to Teaching, not Service.

IV. Candidate’s Service Statement

The candidate must provide (in four pages or fewer) a Service statement describing their contributions, leadership, performance and trajectory in terms of service.

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

G.13 Honors and Other Evidence of Merit or Recognition, including Contracts and Grants

The Honors and Other Evidence of Merit or Recognition, including Contracts and Grants statements are referred to in short in these Guidelines as the Honors and Grants statements.

III. BC/EBC/EC Honors and Grants Statement

The BC/EBC/EC should describe and assess the relevant evidence of exceptional academic or professional merit, as manifested by contracts and grants, medals, fellowships, invitations to speak (e.g., at other universities, at professional society meetings, and in other venues), election to office in scholarly or professional organizations, or other honors received. The statement should contextualize the relative prestige of any honors or other professional recognition that the candidate has received.

Actively seeking and successfully obtaining external funding is a criterion for promotion in those disciplines in which external funding is the norm, is necessary to sustain research, and to help fund students and offer them research and other academic experiences. If external funding is not the norm, a comment to that effect should be part of the statement.

IV. Candidate's Honors and Grants Statement

The candidate must provide (in two pages or fewer) a description of the honors and other evidence of merit or recognition including contracts and grants that they have received during their time in rank.

G.14 Reviewer Letters

Refer to Section D.9 for additional details about selecting reviewers.

A minimum of five external review letters must be compiled that evaluate the contributions and accomplishments of the candidate. All letters must come from external reviewers who are tenured full professors from peer institutions/programs who understand the academic setting and the standards against which the discipline benchmarks research excellence in terms of productivity, impact and trajectory. The emphasis of the review is to evaluate the research contributions and related accomplishments of the candidate, and to summarize their professional standing in the field. The same minimum of five letters applies for candidates with joint appointments. For tenured associate professor candidates who have been in their current rank at UT Austin for more than ten years, the reviewers must be asked to provide a holistic review while also focusing on the contributions and accomplishments during the most recent Normative Time in Rank as defined by their discipline. (Examples of reviewer solicitation letters can be found at this [link](#)).

The following materials must be placed in the promotion dossier with additional information, as noted, being placed in the Supplemental Materials Folder:

III. Chart of Reviewers

All solicited external review letters received concerning a candidate must be included in the candidate's dossier. The department is to prepare a chart of all reviewers solicited using the [template](#) provided by the Provost's Office. Group the reviewers' information by Received, Declined, and No Response, and list in alphabetical order by last name within each group providing the following information:

- Name and rank or title of reviewer.
- Name of institution (including the department) or other agency with which the reviewer is affiliated.
- Brief statement substantiating why the individual was selected.
- Other relevant information about the reviewer that would assist those involved in the process who are not practitioners in the candidate's field.
- Indicate whether selected by department or candidate.

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

- Explanation for any deviations from required reviewers' characterizations (e.g., why a reviewer is from a non-peer institution).
- Date received for letters and declinations.
- The reason for declination, if provided.

IV. Letters Received

Place the external reviewers' letters in alphabetical order by last name. Make note in the upper right-hand corner of the first page of each letter whether the department chair/BC/EBC/EC, candidate, or both, nominated the reviewer. This notation must match the information provided in the chart of reviewers.

All solicited letters received must be included in the candidate's dossier. A short version (not longer than two pages) of the referee's CV or résumé is to be included behind each letter. If the referee provides a full-length CV, only the first two pages will be included.

G.15 Additional Statements

Any additional, non-required statements added to the file shall be date stamped and placed in a separate folder titled Additional Statements.

G.16 Supplemental Materials

Supplemental materials shall accompany the promotion file at each level of review and be made available to all internal parties to whom its content is relevant for their review, deliberations and/or vote.

XVII. Originals of all Students' Written Comments

All student comments from CIS results for the candidate's time in rank or from not more than the last six years of instructional activities at UT Austin (including summer and any other UT student teaching) are to be included in chronological order in a separate folder entitled "CIS Student Comments" within the Supplemental Materials folder. The CIS Summary evaluation page should be included as a coversheet for each class's student comments.

XVIII. Teaching Evaluations from Other Institutions (if applicable)

Candidates who have taught at other institutions during the last six years may submit teaching evaluations from those courses.

XIX. COVID-19 Professional Impact Statement

Candidates may choose to include a two-page COVID Professional Impact Statement in their dossier and in materials distributed to reviewers. The statement must adhere to the guidance on the COVID-19 professional impact statement [webpage](#). The *statement* should briefly document the effects that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on faculty workload and professional opportunities and the resulting impact on faculty professional productivity, performance and trajectory. This statement can be included in the dossier in the supplemental materials folder to contextualize the faculty member's performance and contributions. The statement must be limited to two pages and must not contain any personal information.

XX. Five Significant Works

The five significant works (the same as are distributed for review to the external reviewers) should be included in a separate folder entitled "Five Significant Works Materials" within the Supplemental Materials folder. The Listing of the Five Significant Works (following the university's [template](#)) that lists and details co-authors and the candidate's contributions to each work (Section G.10.II) should appear both in this Five Significant Works Materials folder and in the Research section of the dossier. Include reviews of any of the five significant works (if available).

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

XXI. Documentation Supporting the Status of Forthcoming Works

By definition, a forthcoming work must have been accepted for publication (exhibition, etc.) and requires no further creative or scholarly revision. For example, book manuscripts are considered forthcoming (in production) when all creative and scholarly work has been completed by the author(s) and articles and book chapters must be “in press” to be considered forthcoming. Works that are “forthcoming” at the time the dossier is reviewed will be given more weight than material under review or under contract.

Each forthcoming work listed in the CV must be supported by clearly labeled documentation (e.g. letters of acceptance, contracts, email verifying status that is listed on the document). Include reviews where available. This documentation should be included as a single PDF.

XXII. Mid-Probationary Review (where relevant)

A copy of the [mid-probationary review](#) must be included in the Supplementary Materials folder for all tenure-track assistant professor candidates for tenure who have been in their probationary period at UT Austin for long enough to have received one.

XXIII. Faculty Peer Teaching Observations

The contents of each faculty peer observation must be included, in their entirety, within the Supplementary Materials folder. The chart listing the faculty peer teaching observations (created using the university [template](#)) should be included as the first page of the single PDF containing the actual peer observation materials.

XXIV. Sample Solicitation Letter Used for External Reviewers and List of Materials that were Sent for Evaluation

Sample letters for departments and CSUs to use in soliciting letters from external reviewers are available at this [link](#). Units may tailor these letters to their individual circumstances. However, all external reviewers must be informed that, under Texas law, we cannot ensure the confidentiality of their letters. Reviewers also must be informed of any extension to the probationary period or approved Personal Circumstances Flag (sample letters include a demonstration of how this can be phrased). This is intended to alert reviewers to the relevant time frame to use for their reviews.

In addition to providing a sample solicitation letter used, provide a listing of all materials [e.g., CV, research statement, five significant works completed in rank, COVID-19 professional impact statement (if included), etc.] that were sent to the reviewers for their evaluation.

XXV. Declinations (if applicable)

Provide declination correspondence in a single PDF document in alphabetical order by last name from all reviewers who declined (or fail to respond to) invitations to review. A CV is not required.

XXVI. Letters Solicited from Collaborators

Letters solicited from collaborators must be placed in the supplemental materials and will not count toward the minimum number of external reviewer letters that are required. A CV is not required.

XXVII. Unsolicited Letters Received Prior to BC/EBC/EC Review (if applicable)

Place unsolicited letters in a single PDF document in alphabetical order by last name. A CV is not required for writer of an unsolicited letter.

XXVIII. Unsolicited Letters Received After BC/EBC/EC Committee Review (if applicable)

Place unsolicited letters received after the BC/EBC/EC review alphabetically by last name in a single PDF document. A CV is not required for writer of an unsolicited letter.

XXIX. Other Supplemental Materials

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

In addition to the required materials described in these guidelines, candidates have the discretion to include any materials that they believe are relevant to the promotion or tenure decision. A table of contents must be included as a coversheet to the section of Other Supplemental Materials.

The following folders are included in the dossier reviewed by all levels up through and including the dean. These folders are not included in the dossier that is reviewed by the President:

XXX. Other Publications

Copies of scholarly works must be included in the dossier reviewed by all levels of up through and including the dean. The candidate is responsible for ensuring that all research works listed in their CV are included in their Other Publications folder. All levels of review up to and including the dean should validate that all works cited in the candidate's CV are included in the dossier. Candidates being considered for tenure should include all scholarly works. Other candidates should include all scholarly works produced while in rank.

XXXI. In-Progress or In-Preparation Works

Copies of in-progress or in-preparation manuscripts or creative works listed in the CV must accompany the dossier as far as the dean's office. All levels of review up to and including the dean are responsible for assessing the potential in these contributions as a component of the candidate's pipeline of continuing and future work.

XXXII. Teaching Portfolio

The candidate must include a teaching portfolio for department or college/school review. The portfolio does not accompany the dossier beyond the dean's office.

Candidates should consult with their department chair and/or dean's office for information on compiling a teaching portfolio. The following items are examples of materials appropriate for a portfolio: teaching philosophy, syllabus examples, handouts, problem sets, and other written or references to online materials developed for courses. UT Austin's [Faculty Innovation Center](#) has resources regarding composing and reviewing teaching portfolios.

Section H. OUTCOMES

H.1 Presidential Conferences

The promotion dossiers will be reviewed and discussed by the president's review committee. Each dean will attend a promotion review meeting with the president's review committee to discuss their CSU's candidates. In some cases, in order to make a determination in the best interest of the university, the president may request that formal assessments of a candidate's contributions and achievements be sought from additional experts in the field, or that key stakeholders be invited to address questions not resolved by the record presented or in the conference with the dean.

H.2 Announcement of Decisions

The Office of the President will formally notify deans of the results of the promotion conferences, including those pending cases where an action of terminal appointment is being considered. Every effort will be made to do so no later than February 20, 2023. The president's decisions will remain confidential until February 24, 2023. Candidates will be notified of the president's decision on February 24, 2023.

The President's Committee will revisit all terminal appointment pending cases in April. Final Arguments, if submitted, will be considered at this time (Section H.3). In cases where Final Arguments are not submitted, the president will endeavor to notify deans of the final decision on terminal appointment pending cases by April 10, 2023. The president's decision will remain confidential until April 12, 2023. Candidates will be notified of the president's decision on April 12, 2023.

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

H.3 Final Arguments in Terminal Appointment Pending Cases

Only tenure-track candidates whose case are terminal appointment pending may present further arguments in writing to the president before the case is decided. Final arguments provide candidates an opportunity to write directly to the president regarding the merits of their case. It is helpful, but not required, for the candidate to succinctly address any perceived weaknesses in the file as well as provide any new or additional evidence that has become available since the file was compiled and submitted for review. Address final arguments to the president and deliver an electronic copy to evpp-aps@utexas.edu by March 31, 2023.

The president will refer the written arguments to the dean and department chair (if applicable) for comment and to President's Review Committee members for review and discussion, prior to making a final decision. The president will endeavor to notify deans of the final decision on terminal appointment pending cases where Final Arguments have been submitted by April 17, 2023. The president's decision will remain confidential until April 20, 2023. Candidates will be notified of the president's decision on April 20, 2023.

H.4 Request for Review by the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR)

The candidate or the president may request a review of the case by the [Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility \(CCAFR\)](#). Such a review is limited to one or both of the following: 1) to determine whether, in its judgment, the procedures followed in the candidate's case accorded with both the university's and commonly accepted professional standards for promotion and tenure; and 2) whether the decision was based upon a violation of the faculty member's academic freedom. CCAFR shall not review disputes about professional judgments on the merits of the faculty member's record.

A request for review shall describe the procedural irregularity being asserted and/or the alleged violation of academic freedom being asserted and how it impacted the decision. Candidates have until March 31, 2023, to submit a request for review to the chair of CCAFR and provide a copy to the provost (evpp-aps@utexas.edu). The Provost's Office will distribute copies of the request to the dean and department chair.

CCAFR may delegate its work to a subcommittee of no fewer than three members. CCAFR shall report to the president, with a copy to the candidate, by May 12, 2023. The president will consider the subcommittee's report and advise CCAFR of the outcome of the case. The president may extend the time for the subcommittee to perform its work.

H.5 Reconsideration of a Promotion and Tenure Decision in the Terminal Year

The university has no obligation to provide a faculty member with reconsideration of a tenure decision during the terminal year, however, a department may request it based on submission of substantial new evidence by the candidate. The department is responsible for assessing whether new evidence of productivity presented by a candidate is substantial in nature and sufficiently compelling to merit reconsideration of the decision. Such a review is to examine any new evidence (i.e., evidence not previously considered) to determine whether it clearly demonstrates that the decision made the prior year should be reversed.

If a determination of compelling new evidence is made in a terminal year case, the department will prepare a new promotion file focusing on the new evidence and submit this, along with the previous year's dossier, to each level in the review process. The BC/EBC/EC shall prepare an assessment of the new evidence put forward in each area of contribution.

Reconsideration during the terminal appointment year does not entitle a candidate to an additional terminal year.

H.6 Grievances

Nothing in this document is intended to alter a candidate's right to use the university's existing grievance processes as described in [HOP 2-2310](#).

UT Austin General Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2022-23 Academic Year
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (Excluding the Dell Medical School)

An individual who alleges evidence of an infringement of the Constitution or laws of Texas or the United States may present a grievance in person or through a representative, to the provost, who shall meet with the faculty member. A faculty member may request a review by a hearing tribunal by submitting a written request to the president describing in detail the facts relied upon to prove that the decision was made for reasons that are unlawful. If the president determines that the alleged facts, if proven by credible evidence, support a conclusion that the decision was made for unlawful reasons, such allegations shall be heard by a hearing tribunal in accordance with procedures in [Regents' Rule 31008](#) and the institutional faculty grievance procedure [HOP 2-2310](#).

H.7 Resources

- For assistance with the General Guidelines or the promotion and tenure process generally: Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost at evpp-aps@utexas.edu.
- To speak with a neutral third party about individual concerns: [Faculty Ombuds](#) at facombud@austin.utexas.edu.
- For questions about procedural or academic freedom concerns: [Chair of the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility \(CAFR\)](#).

H.8 HOP, Regents' Rules, State and Federal Law

The HOP, Regents' Rules, state or federal law take precedence over these guidelines.