The University of Texas at Austin
Dell Medical School

2026-27 – GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION - TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Revised October 2025

Table of Contents

Section A: Introduction

As part of The University of Texas Medical Center and working together with our community, the Dell Medical School sets the standard for excellence in integrated, multidisciplinary patient care, pioneering research with meaningful impact, leading innovation in medical education, and catalyzing life sciences entrepreneurship.

The Dell Medical School expects all regular faculty to be active scholars with vital contributions in research, education, and/or clinical practice.

Faculty will align with the Dell Medical School mission to define the future of health by demonstrating commitment to:

- Building a sustainable academic health system that delivers person-centered, integrated care across the continuum.
- Embracing novel, collaborative solutions to ensure that everyone has a fair and just opportunity to be as healthy as possible.
- Empowering patients, families and communities to be active participants in the health care process through information, access, engagement, and agency.
- Cultivating transformative research, entrepreneurship and innovation that leads to real-world impact.
- Equipping faculty, staff and learners with the knowledge and skills necessary to lead the next generation of health care.
- Leading the advancement and use of cutting-edge technologies, data and digital capabilities that serve the needs of patients, physicians, health care professionals, faculty, staff, learners, and our community.

Faculty promotion, and the award of tenure, are based on excellence in performance and scholarship. Candidate performance will be based on pre-established guidelines for achievement set by the medical school, and scholarship is defined as the creation and/or dissemination of new knowledge. Promotion requires a formal review of the candidate's achievements, including an assessment of the candidate's success in accomplishing their duties, the magnitude and the quality of the contributions, and/or specific services rendered, as demonstrated by the candidate's body of work, external letters of evaluation, and the evaluations of students, residents, patients and peers, if applicable.

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. The review must be sufficient in its depth and character to support action in the best interests of the University, whatever the decision reached.

These Guidelines describe the faculty promotion and award of tenure process, preparation of materials, and management of dossiers for tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Dell Medical School. See also the *2026-27 Dell Medical School Tenured and Tenure-Track Promotion Policy* on the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage.

Section B: Area of Excellence and Areas of Review

The Dell Medical School defines four (4) Areas of Review that align with its mission, with promotion in these Areas based on pre-established guidelines for achievement set by the medical school. Tenured and tenure-track faculty designate an eligible Area of Review as their Area of Excellence. Their designated Area of Excellence must be evaluated, and a strong record of accomplishments must be demonstrated in all remaining

Areas of Review.

Academic and Professional Service is an Area of Review but may not be designated as an Area of Excellence. Clinical Expertise is reviewed only for faculty who provide clinical services.

B.1 Clinical Expertise
Enable the delivery and measurement of excellent health care, building a sustainable academic health system that delivers person-centered, integrated care across the continuum, with a focus on quality, health equity, population and/or public health, value, and/or innovation.

B.2 Educational Leadership
Enable the provision of exceptional training, mentoring or curricular development and provide fair and committed support for learners, in alignment with the medical school's mission to equip learners with the knowledge and skills necessary to lead the next generation of healthcare.

B.3 Investigation and Inquiry
Support the development of a rich multidisciplinary environment for research, bringing distinct skills or resources to advance the impact of research, in alignment with the medical school's mission to cultivate transformative research, entrepreneurship and innovation that leads to real-world impact.

B.4 Academic and Professional Service
Advance health care through administrative, community, academic, and professional service, in alignment with the medical school's educational, clinical, and research missions.

Section C. Procedures

C.1 Readiness for and Initiating Promotion Review
Readiness for promotion review for a tenured associate professor will be determined by the department chair or designee. Readiness for promotion review for tenure-track faculty will be determined by the department chair or designee (except in the case of candidates who must be undergo mandatory tenure review since those reviews are determined by the faculty member's years of probationary service). These discussions with the department chair or their designee should occur each year during the annual evaluation process that is required for all faculty members.

C.2 Designation as a Promotion Candidate
Once external letters have been solicited, the faculty member is officially considered a candidate for that year's promotion cycle. At that point, all promotion candidates have the right for their promotion case to progress through all levels of review at the University.

C.3 Progression of Promotion Cases through Levels of Review

Mandatory review cases of tenure-track faculty must progress through all levels of review unless the candidate:
- resigns from the University, or
- is terminated by the University for disciplinary reasons in accordance with Regents' Rule 31008.

Accelerated review cases for tenure-track assistant professors and all promotion review cases for tenured faculty progress through all levels of review unless the candidate:
- withdraws the case prior to review by the president,
- resigns from the University, or
- is terminated by the University for disciplinary reasons in accordance with Regents' Rule 31008.

In certain circumstances, faculty can invoke the right to be considered for promotion and the department chair's endorsement of readiness for promotion is not required. Details can be found below in (Section C.4) Invoking the Right of Consideration to be a Candidate for Promotion Review.

C.4 Invoking the Right of Consideration for Promotion Review
Except when subject to restrictions imposed as discipline for misconduct, a faculty member in the rank of tenured associate professor may invoke their right to be considered for promotion to tenured full professor during the tenth or later effective year in rank.

In the case of a denied promotion or if the tenured associate professor withdraws their dossier from consideration after the departmental executive committee review, the candidate may invoke the right of consideration after five or more effective years in rank. The first year of this five-year count starts in the first academic year after the tenured associate professor candidate withdraws their dossier from consideration or negative promotion decision is made in the spring of the prior academic year. However, the candidate may be considered earlier if the departmental executive committee votes to support (a voting outcome by the committee qualifies as 'support' for a recommended action if at least 50% of eligible voters on the committee votes in favor of the recommendation) and the department chair approves moving the candidate's case forward for promotion review.

Note that the count of effective years in rank does not include any year to which a personal circumstances flag has been applied.

To invoke this right of consideration, the tenured associate professor must advise their department chair of their request to be considered for promotion no later than February 1st of the academic year immediately before the fall of the requested review year.

The case shall be reviewed for promotion at all levels, including the president unless the candidate (1) withdraws the case prior to review by the president's committee, (2) resigns from the University, or (3) is terminated by the University for disciplinary reasons in accordance with Regents' Rule 31008 and UT Systemwide Policy (UTS) 198.

C.5 Levels of Review
Tenured and tenure-track faculty are evaluated at five independent levels: (1) executive committee for department, (2) department chair, (3) Dell Medical School Appointment, Promotions, and Tenure (APT) Committee, (4) dean, and (5) president's review committee. The president of The University of Texas at Austin makes the final recommendation on promotion and tenure for tenure-track candidates. Tenure recommendations are subject to approval by the UT System Board of Regents. The president makes the final decision on promotion from tenured associate professor to tenured professor.

C.6 Eligibility to Vote on a Promotion and Tenure Review Committee
Eligibility to vote on a tenured and tenure-track faculty candidate promotion and tenure review committee is limited to faculty with the following additional eligibility requirements:
- A faculty member with a potential or real conflict of interest related to the candidate is ineligible from voting and must recuse themselves from the review, discussion, and vote on that candidate. See (Section D.1.f).

- Only faculty who hold tenure and are at a higher rank than the candidate may vote on promotion and tenure review for candidates.

- Because department chairs write an independent statement with their recommendation about promotion, they are not eligible to vote as a member of the departmental executive committee. Similarly, the dean is not eligible to vote on the APT Committee.

- Each faculty member participating in a candidate's promotion and tenure review may only vote once and may not vote at both the executive committee and APT Committee levels.

- Review committee members may not vote if they did not attend the committee meeting (approved remote attendance allowed).

C.7 Minimum Number of Eligible Voting Members for Promotion and Tenure Review Committees
Review committees at the department and school level (i.e., the executive committee and APT Committee, respectively) must include at least five eligible voting members for each promotion and tenure case considered. In cases where there are fewer than five eligible voting faculty members on the review committee, all existing committee members will participate in the review and ad hoc reviewers, who meet the voting eligibility criteria, will be invited to participate and vote in the review. Ad hoc members may include voting eligible faculty members from outside the candidate's home department but should not be faculty members from the APT Committee. The ad hoc reviewers must be eligible to vote and be familiar with the candidate's area of excellence and areas of review.

Wherever these Guidelines refer to the roles and responsibilities of the executive committee or APT Committee, the statement also holds true for promotion review committees that include ad hoc reviewers as described in this section.

C.8 Managing Joint Appointments
Faculty may have joint appointments between departments within the Dell Medical School or joint appointments between the Dell Medical School and another college or school at the University.
For faculty with joint appointments with another college or school at the University, the timing of the review will follow the timeline of the other college or school, regardless of whether Dell Medical School or the other college/school is where the primary appointment resides. Therefore, faculty jointly appointed at another college or school at the University could be reviewed earlier than the typical Dell Medical School schedule and still be considered an on-time promotion. See the *2025-26 UT Austin General Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Review of Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty*.

The remainder of this section applies to faculty holding a joint appointment between departments within the Dell Medical School. Information for faculty who hold joint appointments between the Dell Medical School and another college or school at the University can be found in (Section D.4) of the *2025-26 UT Austin General Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Review of Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty*.

1.   Joint Appointment within the Dell Medical School of Less Than 30%
Faculty members holding one or more joint appointments of less than 30% are reviewed **only** in the department corresponding to the primary appointment. The primary department will conduct one review of the candidate at all levels. The joint department will not conduct a formal review of the candidate's materials nor vote on whether or not to promote the candidate.

The department chair or faculty member will request a letter from the joint appointment(s) department chair evaluating the faculty member's contributions to the joint department(s). The following may also be requested from the department(s) corresponding to the joint appointment(s): (a) input regarding selection of external reviewers, (b) participation by eligible faculty in writing the required executive committee

statements, and (c) optional contributions that may be added to the supplemental materials section of the dossier.

2.   Joint Appointment within the Dell Medical School of at Least 30%

Faculty members holding a joint appointment of at least 30% must be reviewed simultaneously in the departments corresponding to both the primary and joint appointments. The departments will each review an identical version of the candidate's dossier.

The department chair corresponding to the candidate's primary appointment is responsible for coordinating with the department chair corresponding to the candidate's joint appointment for the development of the dossier, including: (1) selection and solicitation of external reviewers, and (2) selection of the ad hoc committee charged with reviewing the dossier, writing the required executive committee statement for each area of review, and voting on their recommendation regarding promotion of the candidate. Note that the faculty members on the ad hoc committee assigned to write each of the executive committee statements must meet eligibility requirements and represent both the primary and joint departments.

C.9 Impact of Professional Disruptions

The University recognizes that there may be various external disruptions originating outside of the control of the University and UT System that can introduce professional challenges to the work and contributions of our faculty. For example, the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the work of many faculty members beginning in spring 2020 and extending through spring 2022. Candidates may discuss the direct impact of professional disruptions (e.g., lab closures, global supply chain disruptions, inability to travel for work, delayed funding, delayed lab construction, slowed book presses, etc.) on their professional work and opportunities, as well as the overall impact on their productivity, performance, and trajectory using an optional Impact of Professional Disruptions Statement.

Note that inclusion of an Impact of Professional Disruptions Statement does not exclude the associated period from the review. Executive committee and Dell Med APT Committee reviewers as well as the candidate's department chair/designee and dean must determine the extent to which the disruption impacted the faculty member's performance and trajectory. And the reviewers must use the relevant information to contextualize the candidate's record in rank and consider relevant disruptions and resulting impacts when reviewing faculty accomplishments in rank.

Note: While the COVID-19 pandemic and other disruptions might also have introduced personal challenges for many faculty members, those impacts are addressed by the faculty member designating periods during which their productivity was negatively impacted because of personal circumstances, and those designated periods are excluded from the review. All candidates are evaluated based on the number of either years of probationary service (for tenure-track faculty) or effective years of service in rank (for tenured faculty), not the total time in rank.

C.10 Default Consideration for Promotion and Tenure

Unless otherwise specified in the dossier (executive committee, department chair, and dean statements), candidates on the tenure-track are evaluated for promotion in rank (if not already at the rank of professor) and the award of tenure. Tenured candidates are evaluated for promotion in rank.

C.11 Consideration for Tenure

Tenure-track faculty, except for those at the rank of assistant professor, may be considered for the award of tenure without an advancement in rank. Compared to tenure-track faculty at a given rank, tenured faculty

at the same rank will have a higher impact record and stronger trajectory. The higher impact record will include a higher impact publication record, funding record, **and** leadership record and very strong evidence of geographic reputation. Examples of evidence of a higher impact record in these areas include a higher impact body of peer-reviewed publications, evidence of sustained and competitive funding as principal investigator (as appropriate for the field and Area of Excellence), and high visibility and high impact leadership roles related to the candidate's area of expertise. A stronger trajectory record will include strong evidence that the high impact publication record, funding record, leadership record, and geographic reputation will continue apace.

Section D: Roles and Responsibilities

D.1 Department Chair and Dean Responsibilities

a.   Familiarity with Written Guidelines
Candidates, and all internal reviewers (including executive committee members, department chairs, deans, and APT Committee members) must familiarize themselves with these Guidelines and any other written guidelines provided by the school.

b.   Unbiased Review
The reviews and recommendations at each level of review 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 faculty diversity, etc.).

c.   Candidate Meetings
Readiness for promotion review for a tenured associate professor will be determined by the department chair or designee. Readiness for promotion review for tenure-track faculty will be determined by the department chair or designee (except in the case of candidates who must undergo mandatory tenure review since those reviews are determined by the faculty member's years of probationary service). These discussions with the department chair or their designee should occur each year during the annual evaluation process that is required for all faculty members.

The department chair, or their designee must meet with each candidate in the spring semester prior to the promotion review. The department chair, dean, or designee must:
- Explain the process to the candidate.
- Advise the candidate to become familiar with the applicable guidelines.
- Discuss relative responsibilities for compiling dossier contents.
- Discuss candidate access to the file materials.

d.   Selecting Reviewers
A minimum of five (5) external review letters is required for each tenured and tenure-track faculty candidate's promotion review. The department, while working with the candidate, is responsible for developing a list of a minimum of ten (10) reviewers. All letters must come from external reviewers from peer institutions/programs who have an understanding of the academic setting and the standards against which the area benchmarks itself. The emphasis of the review is to evaluate the research/scholarly/creative contributions and other accomplishments of the candidate, and to summarize their professional standing.

External reviewers should be selected using the following considerations. Any deviations from these considerations must be thoroughly explained in the Summary of Reviewers and Department Chair Statement:

- Credible reviewers and recognized experts serving at peer or aspirational peer institutions who are knowledgeable about the scholarly expectations for promotion at an R1 doctoral university.
- Reviewers must have no potential conflict of interest related to the candidate.
- Reviewers must not be current or recent close collaborators (within the past seven years), former supervisors, advisors, mentors, dissertation chairs, postdoctoral mentors, co-investigators, or collaborators. Ideally, all reviewers will be "arm's length." Arm's length reviewers refer to those who are sufficiently distant from the candidate and are capable of objectively assessing the candidate's merit for promotion without bias or personal or professional conflict of interest. However, the department chair and/or dean (or designee) have some latitude to select external reviewer(s) with whom the candidate had a minor collaboration as co-authors or co-investigators.
- Selected reviewers should be from different institutions.
- Faculty that hold Emeritus appointments cannot be listed as a reviewer.
- All listed reviewers must be either tenured professors or professors whose body of work and stature are commensurate with tenure. Reviewers must hold an active academic appointment. For reviewers who do not have an appointment at the rank of professor with tenure, but who are professors and whose work is considered commensurate with tenure, an explanation regarding how the equivalency of tenured status was determined must be provided.

e. Process for Selecting Reviewers

Prior to sending out the solicitation letter to the external reviewers, the chair or designee shall ask the candidate to provide a list of five (5) names, while also compiling a list of five (5) names of their own. The final list should include a minimum of ten (10) names. It is encouraged to list more than ten (10) names in order to ensure that the minimum of five (5) letters is returned. Once compiled, both the candidate and the chair review the list of individuals to be contacted. After considering concerns that may be expressed by the candidate, the department chair in consultation with the dean (or designee), has final say over reviewer selection. The final list should be made up of a mix of candidate and chair selections with the majority coming from the chair selections. The goal is to have the majority of the returned letters to have been designated by the chair (3 out of the 5).

All candidates must be given at least two (2) business days to review the list of reviewers and then the dean (or designee) must approve the final list of letter writers before the solicitation letter is sent. A faculty member is officially a candidate for promotion once external letters for promotion have been solicited.

Templates for departments to use in soliciting letters from reviewers are available from the Dell Medical School Office of Faculty Academic Affairs. Departments may tailor these templates to their individual circumstances. However, all reviewers must be informed that, under Texas law, we cannot ensure the confidentiality of letters from reviewers. Reviewers also must be informed of any extensions to the probationary period or approved personal circumstances flag (templates include recommended text). The intent of this information is to alert reviewers to the relevant time frame to use in their review of the candidate.

Solicitation will include candidate's CV and the Dell Medical School Tenured and Tenure-Track Promotion Policy. It is strongly recommended that the solicitation also include: candidate statements, summaries of activities in relevant Area of Excellence and Areas of Review, and Five Most Significant Works Completed in Rank, as applicable.

For candidates who have chosen Clinical Expertise as their Area of Excellence it may be helpful to provide some or all of following information to their reviewers:
- Outcome measurement and attainment compared with peers, incorporation of outcomes to clinical care improvement, areas of clinical expertise critical to health delivery enterprise
- Quality of contributions to clinical practice
- Scholarship in clinical discipline
- Invited lectureship or editorial services
- Development of protocols or technology
- Mentorship of clinical learners
- External recognition (i.e. awards received, etc.)

Letters may be solicited from collaborators, but these letters do not count toward the minimum number of letters required from reviewers and should not appear within the main dossier's set of reviewer letters.

f. Conflict of Interest
Any faculty member, department chair, or dean involved in the promotion review (Section C.6) with an actual or potential conflict of interest related to a candidate (e.g., spouse, partner, Ph.D. advisor, postdoctoral mentor, etc.) must recuse themselves from the review, discussion, and vote on that candidate. For purposes of this provision, a conflict of interest exists in the following situations:
- A member of the promotion review committees (executive committee or APT Committee), the department chair, or the dean was either a respondent or complainant in a University misconduct matter, and the promotion candidate was an opposing party in the same matter (i.e., one was a complainant and the other a respondent).
- The complainant alleged that the respondent's misconduct was directed against or harmed the complainant.
- The matter resulted in a finding that the respondent committed a policy violation or engaged in behavior subject to discipline.

For purposes of this provision, a potential conflict of interest exists when the Provost's Faculty Affairs team, in consultation with the Office of the Vice President of Legal Affairs, determines that the underlying facts in a given scenario cause the appearance of a conflict that undermines University confidence in the fairness of the process. This determination is final.

The dean or their designee should contact the Provost's Faculty Affairs team regarding voting eligibility in the event of similar situations that did not result in a finding or that are under investigation at the time of the dossier review.

g. 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 actual or potential conflict of interest as discussed in (Section D.1.f.) and eligible to vote on the promotion case as defined in (Section C.6). 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 an actual or potential conflict of interest.

h. Eligibility to Serve as Dean for a Promotion Review

Individuals serving as dean for a candidate's promotion review must be free from actual or potential conflict of interest as discussed in (Section D.1.f.) and eligible to vote on the promotion case as defined in (Section C.6). 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 an actual or potential conflict of interest.

i. Participation in Deliberations

The department chair is to be present for the respective executive committee discussions of each case but does not vote. The dean or their designee must be present for the APT Committee discussions of each case but does not vote. Department chair and dean are to provide separate assessments of the candidate's contributions and recommended action.

j. List of Internal Review Committee Members

The dean or their designee must compile a list of all members of the internal review committees at the department, school and University levels and provide the candidate with at least two business days to identify potential conflicts of interest (Section D.1.f). Any actual or potential conflict of interest must be shared with and resolved by the dean or their designee (Section D.1.f) before the promotion review begins.

If the actual or potential conflict of interest involves the dean or a member of the president's review committee, the Faculty Affairs team in the Provost's Office must be engaged in the resolution.

D.2 Candidate Responsibilities

a. Dossier Preparation

Candidates should familiarize themselves with these Guidelines and any other written guidelines provided by the school with respect to the promotion process and dossier assembly. Consult with the department chair or designee about the relative responsibilities for compiling the information. Candidates have the discretion to include any materials that they believe are relevant to the promotion decision.

b. Review Reviewer List

The candidate shall provide the department chair/executive committee with a list of five (5) recommended individuals to provide peer review letters. The candidate shall review the complete list of individuals selected prior to the dean's (or designee's) approval and prior to the department chair sending out the solicitation letters. Concerns about any reviewers on the list may be expressed to the department chair. The department chair will submit the list of possible reviewers to the dean's office for approval. Following the dean's office approval, the department chair has final say over reviewer selection and the majority of the selection needs to be from the department chair's designated list. The candidate may place a statement in the dossier to document any concerns they may have regarding reviewer selection.

c. Review of Materials

Before the departmental committee considers a case, the department chair shall ask the candidate to check the materials in the promotion dossier. The purpose of this review is to ensure that all candidate materials are enclosed in the dossier as submitted by the candidate. If the candidate believes that the file is incomplete or includes inappropriate material, or if the candidate has any other objection to the process, the department chair, dean, or their designee 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 file about the problem or other aspects of the case.

D.3 Executive Committee Obligations

Departmental executive committee (EC) shall evaluate the credentials and qualifications of faculty members. The executive committee statements included in the candidate's dossier will include vote tally, explanation for the committee's vote and resulting recommendation. See Appendix G.1 for list of possible outcomes based on tenure status and rank.

D.4 APT Committee Obligations

The Dell Medical School's Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee shall evaluate the credentials and qualifications of faculty members and make recommendations to the dean of the medical school concerning appointments and promotion in rank. The APT Committee shall be appointed from among those tenured, tenure-track, and professional-track faculty members of the school who hold the rank of professor or associate professor, but who are not department chairs. All committee votes are to be recorded on the Promotion Review and Voting Sheet along with the number ineligible to vote and absent.

D.5 University Obligations

a. 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 their promotion dossier at any time during the promotion process. To request access, the candidate must make a request in writing to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost through the University's Faculty Affairs and Academic Personnel Services Portal at https://ut.service-now.com/evpp.

b. Updates to the Dossier by the Candidate

The candidate's contributions to the dossier (CV and required statements) must be finalized before the review by the executive committee. If a candidate wishes to update their CV after promotion review has already started, then they must put the updated CV in the Other Supplemental Materials folder. The CV must be dated, and updates must be highlighted. **Recommended updates include information on grants, publications, etc. that have become available since the file was compiled and submitted for review**. The president's committee may request an update from the candidate during the spring as part of its review of the dossier.

c. Information Included in the Dossier by Reference

All accomplishments listed in the CV (e.g., papers, books, research grants, etc.) are included in the dossier by reference. In addition, information that is available to deans, chairs, and members of the president's committee via University administrative systems (e.g., Workday, Research Management System, Faculty Profile, course evaluation survey results, dashboards distributed by Data to Insights, etc.) may be considered by the reviewers at any level.

d. Additions to Dossier

If information is added to the promotion dossier after the candidate reviews the dossier in response to questions from the executive committee, department chair, APT Committee, dean, or president's committee, the materials must be placed in the dossier and the date that the materials were added must be indicated.

The department chair/dean (or designee) must inform the candidate that materials were added to the dossier, and the candidate must be given the opportunity to place a statement in the dossier addressing the added materials. All administrative parties who have already reviewed the dossier will also be notified of the inclusion of additional materials. The candidate will not be notified when required statements are added to the dossier after their review, such as the department chair's statement or the dean's statement.

e. Issues beyond the Scope of the Promotion Process
In rare cases, a promotion review may raise issues that the promotion process is not well suited to resolve. For example, an accusation about academic integrity may be relevant to a decision about promotion but may be difficult to resolve adequately in the promotion process. In such cases, the department chair or dean (or designee), in consultation with the provost and president, may delay the promotion process until the matter is resolved by an appropriate body separate from the promotion process.

Section E: Dossier Assembly

Tenured and tenure-track faculty require evaluation in a designated Area of Excellence and a strong record of accomplishments in all remaining Areas of Review. Dossiers must be assembled with the following specified supporting documentation.

Evidence of clinical expertise is required of all faculty engaged in clinical care, either as the designated Area of Excellence or Area of Review. Clinical expertise is reviewed only for faculty who provide clinical services.

E.1 Promotion Review and Voting Sheet
All executive committee member votes, the department chair recommendation, APT Committee member votes, and the dean recommendation are recorded on the Promotion Review and Voting Sheet. Votes are taken after the evidence is compiled, not before, and repeated voting to achieve unanimity is not endorsed. Only faculty who hold tenure and are at a higher rank than the candidate are eligible to vote. The Office of Faculty Academic Affairs will add the votes and recommendations to the Promotion Review and Voting Sheet.

E.2 Dean's Statement
The Dean's statement should limit the amount of information that is duplicated from the chair's statement. This statement must be dated and contain the following (in no particular order):
- A summary of the APT Committee's discussion; explanation of the rationale for the committee's vote and resulting recommendation; explanation of negative votes. The dean must solicit feedback from the committee regarding reasons for negative votes (if any) to characterize the overall strength of the committee's recommendations and any areas of concern. The dean's statement must also explain the reason for any eligible Dell Med APT Committee voter's absence.
- Explicit contextualization and assessment of the candidate's scholarly trajectory (including citations) based on their demonstrated productivity, current and future (where relevant), research independence, and evidence of funding sustainability (if applicable).
- Evaluate the relative selectivity of publication outlets and prestige of honors/awards.
- Reflect on the reviewers' letters and explain any reservations expressed therein. Describe the relative strength of their overall recommendation (e.g., strongly recommend or recommend).
- Affirmation for accelerated review (if applicable).
- Independent assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in each of the Areas of Review with a focus on time in rank for tenure-track candidates and in most recent normative time in rank for tenured candidates.

- Clearly stated recommended action, which will be recorded on the Promotion Review and Voting Sheet. A list of possible outcomes by rank/track is included in Appendix G.

E.3 Department Chair's Statement

The Department Chair's Statement must not be longer than four (4) pages in length, must be dated, and contain the following (in no particular order):

- Reflect on the statements prepared by the executive committee in each of the Areas of Review. Contextualize the candidate's contributions compared with the norms in the field.
  - If not thoroughly addressed in the executive committee statement, describe the candidate's scholarly contributions in rank relative to the standards of excellence in the field. Explicit contextualization and assessment of the candidate's scholarly trajectory and sustainability based on the candidate's demonstrated productivity, current and future funding (where relevant), and in-progress and in-preparation works. Evaluation of citations should be included as part of the evaluation of scholarly trajectory, if appropriate for the discipline.
  - For candidates that have designated Educational Leadership as their Area of Excellence: If not thoroughly addressed in the executive committee statement, assess the candidate's teaching performance and trajectory and contributions to the department's teaching mission.
  - For candidates that have designated Investigation and Inquiry as their Area of Excellence: Comment on the NIH mean Relative Citation Ratio (RCR) index and iCite profile which must be included in the candidate statement.
  - A summary of the executive committee's discussion; including an explanation of the rationale for the committee's vote and resulting recommendation; explanation of negative votes. The department chair must solicit feedback from the committee regarding the reasons for negative votes (if any) to characterize the overall strength of the committee's recommendations and any areas of concern. The chair's statement must also explain the reason for any eligible Executive Committee voter's absence.
- Description of the standards of excellence in the discipline.
- Summarize the prestige/quality of the scholarly outlets (e.g., journal, academic press).
- Information about the significance of the candidate's field to the strategic priorities of the department and the Dell Medical School.
- The statement should discuss activities in the Area of Excellence and Areas of Review, with a focus on their impact and trajectory. The statement should directly address scholarly contributions as well as clinical activities and impact, service/leadership and impact, educational activities and impact, mentorship and impact, and community-facing scholarship and practice and impact, as applicable.
- For the proposed rank of associate professor with tenure: Department Chair Statement should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution).
  - Chair's assessment of all other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank.
- For the proposed rank of associate professor with tenure: Department Chair Statement must discuss what evidence there is – and the strength of the evidence – that the candidate is independently driving a program of research that has garnered an established national reputation and includes independent extramural funding as appropriate for the field.
- For the proposed rank of professor with tenure: Department Chair Statement must discuss what evidence there is – and the strength of the evidence – that the candidate is independently driving a

program a program of research that has garnered a sustained national / emerging international reputation and includes independent extramural funding as appropriate for the field.

- For tenure-track candidates:
  - Assess the level of independent research activity in rank.
  - Explain any continuing collaboration with former advisor(s) and/or mentor(s) and extensive collaborations with peer or senior faculty members.
  - If applicable, reflection on the mid-probationary review and the progress that the candidate has made in addressing any concerns raised during the review.
- For tenured candidates:
  - Assess the level of independent research activity and research leadership roles in rank.
  - If the candidate's effective time in rank is longer than the normative period for their discipline, the evaluation must focus on the candidate's record during the most recent normative time in rank.
  - If applicable, reflection on any comprehensive periodic reviews for tenured associate professors and the progress that the candidate has made in addressing any concerns raised during the review.
- Reflect on the letters from external reviewers. Include an explanation for any reviewer selection that is not within the parameters described in (Section D.1.d). Do not quote extensively from the reviewers' letters, but address any concerns raised by the external reviewers. If external reviewers identify peers for comparison, provide a high-level comparison of the key metrics for the candidate with those of the peers.
- Review learner evaluations in the dossier and address any areas of intervention. Should the dossier include learner evaluations with negative comments from learners, include information on efforts made to improve, as applicable.
- Provide attestation that the promotion candidate acts as a role model of professionalism and collegial behavior to all members of the health care team.
- Explain the timing of the promotion review (e.g., mandatory review, accelerated review, or candidate invoked right of consideration) and provide justification for an accelerated review or promotion after an extended time in rank.
- Independent assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
- Describe the relative strength of their overall recommendation (e.g., strongly recommend or recommend). Clearly stated recommended action, which will be recorded on the Promotion Review and Voting Sheet. A list of possible outcomes by rank/track is included in Appendix G.

E.4 Statements from Other Administrators (if applicable)
Additional statements evaluating the candidate's contributions may be provided by unit heads in a variety of circumstances including, but not limited to, the following examples. The statement must not be more than four (4) pages in length and must be dated.

- If the faculty member holds a joint appointment of less than 30% or a courtesy appointment in another unit or units, the unit's department chair or dean may provide a statement.
- If the faculty member contributes to an organized research unit, the director may provide a statement.

E.5 CV
The candidate's dossier is to include a curriculum vitae (CV) using the Dell Medical School CV template. The CV template provides instruction on how to include annotations and organize work and accomplishments, so that they are recognized for their merit. The CV template and a CV Review Checklist can be found on the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage and should be used by the candidate

to ensure the CV follows the CV template. **Please note: CVs that are not aligned with the CV template may put timeliness of promotion review at risk.**

Do **not** duplicate information in the CV in other parts of the dossier unless specified in these Guidelines.

E.6 Clinical Expertise
This section includes the supporting documentation required to demonstrate excellence in Clinical Expertise. The section is required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty who provide clinical services. All information in the Clinical Expertise section should be compiled into a single PDF document.

E.6.1 Executive Committee Statement
The executive committee (EC) must provide a statement assessing activity, impact, and trajectory in clinical expertise and clinical service, with a focus on scholarship (broadly defined), that includes both the signatures and typed names of all the executive committee members and the date it was written. The document is to provide an explanation of the evaluation procedures and measures used and the assessment should:
- For promotion to the rank of associate professor, committee's assessment should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution). Committee's assessment of all other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank.
- Discuss scholarship – contributions to the development, dissemination, and translation of health professional education, knowledge, and practices and the impact and trajectory of this work.
- Discuss service/leadership – activities that support the University, our broader society, and the faculty member's profession beyond the scope of the faculty member's official responsibilities.
- Discuss relevant evidence of merit or recognition for clinical excellence such as quality metrics, referral base, sustained involvement in committees/task forces related to clinical care, invited presentations, and/or awards.
- Discuss evidence of relevant geographical reputation.
- Discuss educational activity – teaching in the clinic or hospital setting (include detail on learner feedback), curriculum development, participation in departmental, school, University, or professional society educational activities, awards for teaching.
- Discuss mentorship – number and stature of mentees, impact/product(s) of mentoring relationships, awards for mentoring.
- Discuss community-facing scholarship and practice – scholarly contributions to service and community engagement related to improving the health of the community.
- Discuss honors and awards. Note the relative prestige of honors or professional recognitions received and distinguish between those awards made based on promise and those awarded based on accomplishment.
- Discuss trajectory – evidence that the impact of activities is increasing over time.
- For tenured and tenure-track candidates, eligible EC members will vote from list of outcomes. See Appendix G for list of outcomes.
- Include vote tally that specifies:
  - How many EC members were present during the discussion and are eligible to vote on the dossier.
  - How many EC members were absent.
  - Required: Explain all eligible Executive Committee (EC) absences. If an EC member was eligible to vote on the dossier and did not attend the promotion dossier review

16

meeting, please include an explanation for the absence (Ex: clinical schedule conflict, teaching conflict, etc.).
- How many EC members were present but not eligible to vote (due to rank, conflict of interest).
- How many eligible EC members voted for each outcome.
- Include explanation of the rationale for the committee's vote and resulting recommendation.

E.6.2 Candidate Statement
The candidate must provide, in four (4) pages or less, a candidate statement of contributions and achievements in Clinical Expertise and clinical service, with a focus on scholarship (broadly defined), during the requisite time in rank. The statement should discuss activity, impact, and trajectory of scholarship, service/leadership, educational activities, mentorship, community-facing scholarship, and practice. Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution). All other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank.

E.6.3 Summary of Clinical Activities
Tenured and tenure-track candidates must include activities for the entire probationary period or time in rank as applicable. It is important to include annotated descriptions of each activity and candidate's role in the activity and time commitment of the activity. Examples of Summaries of Clinical Activities can be found on the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage.

E.6.4 Honors and Awards
The candidate should identify any honors or professional recognitions received for Clinical Expertise. If candidates took a program or course and received a certificate, this is not viewed as an award. Certificates can be placed in the supplemental folder section of the dossier.

E.7 Educational Leadership
This section includes the supporting documentation required to demonstrate excellence in Educational Leadership. The section is required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty. All information in the educational leadership section should be compiled into a single PDF document.

E.7.1 Executive Committee (EC) Statement
The executive committee must provide a statement assessing activity, impact, and trajectory in educational leadership, with a focus on scholarship (broadly defined), that includes both the signatures and typed names of all executive committee members and the date it was written. The document is to provide an explanation of the evaluation procedures and measures used and the assessment should:
- For promotion to the rank of associate professor, committee's assessment should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution). Committee's assessment of all other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank.
- Discuss scholarship – contributions to the development, dissemination, and translation of health professional education, knowledge, and practices.

- Discuss service/leadership in education – activities that support the University, our broader society, and the faculty member's profession beyond the scope of the faculty member's official responsibilities.
- Discuss educational activity – didactic and/or clinical teaching (include detail on learner feedback), curriculum development, participation in departmental, school, university, or professional society educational activities, awards for teaching.
- Discuss mentorship – number and stature of mentees, impact/product(s) of mentoring relationships, awards for mentoring.
- Discuss community-facing scholarship and practice – scholarly contributions to service and community engagement related to improving the health of the community.
- Discuss honors and awards. Note the relative prestige of honors or professional recognitions received and distinguish between those awards made based on promise and those awarded based on accomplishment.
- Discuss trajectory – evidence that the impact of activities is increasing over time.
- For tenured and tenure-track candidates, eligible EC members will vote from list of outcomes. See Appendix G for list of outcomes.
- Include vote tally that specifies:
    - How many EC members were present during the discussion and are eligible to vote on the dossier.
    - How many EC members were absent.
    - Required: Explain all eligible Executive Committee (EC) absences. If an EC member was eligible to vote on the dossier and did not attend the promotion dossier review meeting, please include an explanation for the absence (Ex: clinical schedule conflict, teaching conflict, etc.).
    - How many EC members were present but not eligible to vote (due to rank, conflict of interest).
    - How many eligible EC members voted for each outcome.
- Include explanation of the rationale for the committee's vote and resulting recommendation.

E.7.2 Candidate Statement
The candidate must provide, in four (4) pages or less, a candidate statement of contributions and achievements in Educational Leadership, with a focus on scholarship (broadly defined), during the requisite time in rank. The statement should discuss activity, impact, and trajectory of scholarship, service/leadership, educational activities, mentorship, community-facing scholarship and practice. Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution). All other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank.

E.7.3 Summary of Instructional Activities
Tenured and tenure-track candidates must include activities for the entire probationary period or time in rank, as applicable. The summary should include didactic, seminar and bedside teaching for medical students, graduate students, and trainees. If the candidate has supervised graduate students or postdoctoral fellows, this section must include a list of the names of those supervised. For postdoctoral fellows supervised, candidates must list the fellow's name, institution awarding the PhD, and date conferred. It is important to include annotated descriptions of each activity and candidate's role in the activity and the time committed to the activity. Examples of Summaries of Instructional Activities can be found within the Promotion and Tenure Resource Library for Faculty

on the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage.

E.7.4 Honors and Awards
The candidate should identify any honors or professional recognitions received for Educational Leadership. If candidates took a program or course and received a certificate, this is not viewed as an award. Certificates can be placed in the supplemental folder section of the dossier.

E.8 Investigation and Inquiry
This section includes the supporting documentation required to demonstrate excellence in Investigation and Inquiry. The section is required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty. All information in the Investigation and Inquiry section should be compiled into a single PDF document.

E.8.1 Executive Committee (EC) Statement
The executive committee must provide a statement assessing activity, impact, and trajectory of the research/scholarly/creative contributions that includes both the typed names and signatures of all executive committee members and include the date it was written. The document is to provide an explanation of the evaluation procedures and measures used and the assessment should:

- For promotion to the rank of associate professor, committee's assessment should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution). Committee's assessment of all other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank.
- Describe which area(s) of the field is the focus of the faculty member's work.
- Identify and comment on those items that are considered to be of major significance or outstanding quality while in rank at UT Austin or since the most recent promotion, as appropriate.
- Include a brief statement of the basis for qualitative judgments in the area or discipline.
- Discuss scholarship – contributions to the development, dissemination, and translation of health professional education, knowledge, and practices. Be clear about the norms of the field and indicate, for example, the quality of the outlets for a candidate's work (e.g., journals, presses, art galleries, performance venues, etc.); Explain the norms of co-authorship, where applicable, and whether a peer review was involved.
- Describe how the candidate's research fits within the context of their field and explain it in a way that is accessible to those outside of their field.
- Discuss service/leadership in research – activities that support the University, our broader society, and the faculty member's profession beyond the scope of the faculty member's official responsibilities.
- Discuss funding record – success and trajectory in obtaining competitive external funding (as applicable for rank and title series) to support their research.
- Discuss educational activity – lectures, grand rounds, seminars, tutorials, etc. related to area of research expertise (include detail on learner feedback).
- Discuss mentorship – number and stature of mentees, impact/product(s) of mentoring relationships, awards for mentoring.
- Discuss community-facing scholarship and practice – scholarly contributions to service and community engagement related to improving the health of the community.
- Discuss honors and awards in research. Note the relative prestige of honors or professional recognitions received and distinguish between those awards made based on promise and those awarded based on accomplishment.
- Discuss trajectory – evidence that the impact of activities is increasing over time.

- For tenured and tenure-track candidates, eligible EC members will vote from list of outcomes. See Appendix G for list of outcomes.
- Include vote tally that specifies:
  - How many EC members were present during the discussion and are eligible to vote on the dossier.
  - How many EC members were absent.
  - Required: Explain all eligible Executive Committee (EC) absences. If an EC member was eligible to vote on the dossier and did not attend the promotion dossier review meeting, please include an explanation for the absence (Ex: clinical schedule conflict, teaching conflict, etc.).
  - How many EC members were present but not eligible to vote (due to rank, conflict of interest).
  - How many eligible EC members voted for each outcome.
- Include explanation of the rationale for the committee's vote and resulting recommendation.

E.8.2 Candidate Statement

The candidate must provide in four (4) pages or less a candidate statement of contributions and achievements in investigation and inquiry during the requisite time in rank. The NIH mean Relative Citation Ratio (RCR) index for the time in rank must be included in the candidate statement for Investigation and Inquiry as a link to the faculty member's iCite profile. The statement should discuss activity, impact, and trajectory of scholarship, service/leadership, funding record, educational activities, mentorship, community-facing scholarship and practice.

In terms of impact of scholarship, the candidate statement must provide detail that contextualizes the caliber of outlets (e.g., press, journal, conference, exhibition space, etc.) in which their research, scholarship, and creative endeavors have appeared in rank. This contextualization can include a description of the ranking of the impact of the outlet or other measures (if available) to help describe the outlet's quality.

Actively seeking and successfully obtaining external funding is a consideration for promotion and success in funding must be addressed in the candidate's statement. Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution) and are encouraged to articulate a plan for sustaining their program. All other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank.

The candidate must provide an overview of their research and scholarly collaborations and how their participation contributed to the overall impact of the work. Candidates are encouraged to group their scholarly activities by collaboration and identify the publications and grants using the numbering schemes on their CV. The discussion must address the nature of the collaborations, the standards for listing co-authors on papers, their roles and responsibilities on any grants, and metrics for evaluating their individual contributions to the collaboration. Several example scenarios are outlined below.
- A candidate has continued to collaborate with their PhD advisor or postdoc mentor throughout their time in rank. The discussion must address why these collaborations are in the best interest of the candidate's future development as an independent researcher.

- A candidate and a tenured faculty member in their primary academic unit collaborate frequently. The discussion must address the candidate's unique contributions to the collaboration.
- A candidate is part of a large consortium of researchers from around the world who use a field observatory. Most of the candidate's publications include the names of all the consortium members.
- A candidate is funded via a multi-institutional NIH grant with researchers from multiple other universities. Most of the candidate's publications include the names of the principal investigators from the other universities.

E.8.3 Summary of External Research Grants (if applicable)

The Faculty Affairs team in the Provost's Office will distribute a list to the Dell Medical School Office of Faculty Academic Affairs for inclusion in the dossier. The Office of the Vice President for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Endeavors generates the list and includes the candidate's role on each external research grant. Candidates will review their Summary of External Research Grants and provide updates/corrections to the document (if applicable).

E.8.4 List of Five Most Significant Works Completed in Rank

The candidate must identify the five most significant works completed while in their current rank. **It is recommended that the candidate select works that are published.** The candidate must provide a list of those works using the 5 Significant Works template on the Promotion and Tenure Resource Library. If significant works were sent to reviewers providing letters of assessment, then those are the works that must be included here. If publication status of any Work changes while under review, then this change can be documented in relevant section and revised manuscript version can be saved in Other Supplemental Materials section. For each of the works that is co-authored, the candidate must include the following information:
- If any of the co-authors were former mentees of the candidate (e.g., graduate students or postdoctoral researchers), the names of those co-authors must be italicized.
- If any of the co-authors were graduate advisors or postdoctoral mentors of the candidate, the names of those co-authors must be highlighted.
- Provide a brief indication of the relationship between each co-author and the candidate (e.g., current or former student, postdoctoral mentee, peer faculty member, or senior faculty member), and the affiliation of each co-author at the time that the paper was submitted for review.
- Include a brief qualitative statement of the candidate's contribution to the work.
- Provide a brief statement about the choice of publication/performance venue for this work.

E.8.5 Honors and Awards

The candidate should identify any honors or professional recognitions received for their research or scholarly work. If candidates took a program or course and received a certificate, this is not viewed as an award. Certificates can be placed in the Supplemental Materials folder.

E.9 Academic and Professional Service

This section includes the supporting documentation required to demonstrate a record of and evidence supporting a future trajectory of excellence in terms of Academic and Professional Service. This section is required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

E.9.1   Executive Committee Statement

The executive committee must provide a statement assessing the quality of the candidate's performance, contributions, leadership, impact and trajectory with respect to Academic and Professional Service (at the level of their academic program, department, school, and/or University), academic and professional organizations, and/or community that includes both the signatures and typed names of all executive committee members and the date it was written. The statement should:

- For promotion to the rank of associate professor, committee's assessment should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointed as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution). Committee's assessment of all other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank.
- Discuss the candidate's contributions in academic and professional service during the entire probationary period or time in rank, as applicable.
- Discuss the nature of activities cited in support of the recommendation and assess the quality of the service contributions.
- Discuss the candidate's service in scholarly or professional organizations and its significance.
- Discuss the candidate's honors or professional recognitions received and distinguish between those awards made based on promise and those based on accomplishment.
- For tenured and tenure-track candidates, eligible EC members will vote from list of outcomes. See Appendix G for list of outcomes.
- Include vote tally that specifies:
    - How many EC members were present during the discussion and are eligible to vote on the dossier.
    - How many EC members were absent.
    - Required: Explain all eligible Executive Committee (EC) absences. If an EC member was eligible to vote on the dossier and did not attend the promotion dossier review meeting, please include an explanation for the absence (Ex: clinical schedule conflict, teaching conflict, etc.).
    - How many EC members were present but not eligible to vote (due to rank, conflict of interest).
    - How many eligible EC members voted for each outcome.
- Include explanation of the rationale for the committee's vote and resulting recommendation.

E.9.2 Candidate Statement on Academic and Professional Service

The candidate must provide in four (4) pages or less a statement summarizing record of and evidence supporting contributions, performance and trajectory of excellence in terms of Academic and Professional Service. Candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments during probationary period or while in rank, as applicable.

E.9.3 Summary of Academic and Professional Service Activities

Candidates must prepare a summary of Academic and Professional Service activities during the probationary period or while in rank, as applicable. It is important to include annotated descriptions of each activity, candidate's role in the activity, and time commitment of the activity. Positions of leadership should be noted along with honors or professional recognitions received for service work. Examples of Summaries of Academic and Professional Service Activities can be found on the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage.

E.10 Review Letters

A minimum of five (5) external review letters that evaluate the contributions and accomplishments of the candidate must be included in the dossier. See (Section D.1.d.) for information on external review letters.

E.11 Summary of Reviewers

All solicited review letters received concerning a candidate must be included in the candidate's dossier. The department is to prepare a Summary of Reviewers solicited using the Summary of Reviewers template (template can be found on the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage). Group by Received, Declined, and No Response, and list in alphabetical order by last name within each group providing the following information:

- Name and rank, title of reviewer;
- Name of institution (including the department) with which the reviewer is affiliated;
- Brief statement about why the individual was selected;
- Confirm that the external reviewer is arms-length.
- 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;
- Indicate date received for letters and declinations;
- Include the reason for declination, if provided; and
- Include an explanation for any deviations from those considerations listed.

Note that for any reviewer's letter received after the executive committee review:

- The letter should be placed in the Supplemental Materials folder; and
- In the Date Letter Received field of the Summary of Reviewers table, an asterisk (*) should be inserted at the end of the received date for the relevant letter.

E.12 Letters Received

Place the letters received before the vote of the executive committee in alphabetical order by last name. Make note in the upper right-hand corner of the first page of each letter whether the department or candidate nominated the letter writer. This notation should match the information provided on Summary of Reviewers.

All solicited letters received before the executive committee review has begun must be included in the candidate's dossier. Any solicited letter received after the executive committee vote will be placed in Supplemental Materials folder. A short version of the reviewer's CV is to be included behind each letter.

E.13 Additional Statements

Any additional statements, including those required by the school but not the University and those added by the candidate after the dossier review has commenced, shall be placed in this section of the dossier. All statements must include the date the information was added to the dossier. (Section D.5.d) provides instructions for required notifications when an additional statement is added to the dossier.

E.14 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.

E.14.1   Mid-Probationary Review Summary (if applicable)

This section must include a copy of the candidate's mid-probationary review report for all tenure-

track candidates who have completed at least three years of probationary service at UT Austin and for whom a mid-probationary review was conducted.

E.14.2   Comprehensive Periodic Review Report (if applicable)
A copy of the candidate's most recent comprehensive periodic review report must be included in this section for tenured associate professors for whom a comprehensive periodic review was conducted while in rank.

E.14.3   Five Most Significant Works
Required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty. The candidate is to make the selection of the five most significant works while in their probationary period or current rank, as applicable, and provide an introductory paragraph for each work that tells the significance of the work and its impact on the field. Include a listing of the five works in the dossier. **It is recommended that the candidate select works that are published.** If significant works were sent to reviewers providing letters of assessment, then those are the works that must be included here.

The full text of the five most significant works will be placed with the supplemental materials, <u>not</u> in the dossier.

E.14.4 Sample Solicitation Letter Sent to External Reviewers
The department must provide a sample letter that was sent to the external reviewers requesting their evaluation of the candidate.

E.14.5 List of Materials Sent to Reviewer
Provide a listing of all materials (e.g., CV, candidate statements and summaries of activities, five most significant works) that were sent to the reviewers to facilitate their evaluation of the candidate.

E.14.6 Correspondence from External Reviewers Wo Did Not Provide an Evaluation (if applicable)
Place any declination correspondence in alphabetical order by last name behind the letters received. A CV is not required.

E.14.7 Correspondence from Reviewers Received after the Executive Committee review (if applicable)
Letters from external reviewers that are received after the Executive Committee review has begun must be included in this folder in alphabetical order by last name.

E.14.8 Letters Solicited from Collaborators (if applicable)
The department is to prepare a separate Summary of Reviewers for letters solicited from collaborators, listed in alphabetical order by last name, using the Summary of Reviewers template. Letters solicited from collaborators must be placed behind the Summary of Reviewers in a section separate from those solicited from arm's length reviewers and will not count toward the minimum number of letters that are required. A CV is not required.

E.14.9   Letters Solicited from Mentees (if applicable)
The department is to prepare a separate Summary of Reviewers for letters solicited from mentees,

listed in alphabetical order by last name, using the Summary of Reviewers template. Letters solicited from mentees must be placed behind the Summary of Reviewers. A CV is not required.

E.14.10 Learner Evaluations
The candidate must provide a summary of all learner evaluations while in rank, grouped by course or experience and listed in chronological order. These will be placed in the supplemental folder in the following order: medical student evaluations, resident evaluations, and continuing medical education evaluations. Please clearly label each with a header.

E.14.11 Student Comments (if applicable)
All student comments from formal, end-of-semester course evaluations (CIS and CES) collected during the probationary period at UT Austin for tenure-track faculty and the time in rank at UT Austin or six (6) years, whichever is shorter, for tenured faculty must be placed in a folder in this section.

The comments related to each class (defined by unique number) must be saved as a separate PDF document, and courses must be organized in chronological order within the folder. The CIS summary evaluation page or CES summary must be included as the first page of each document, followed by the complete set of student comments for the relevant course.

E.14.12 Peer Observation of Teaching (if applicable)
Inclusion of Peer Observation of Teaching Reports and Reflective Statements is optional for all faculty that interact with learners. Peer Observation Forms are available on the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage. If there is not a form on the website that suits your needs, please contact Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs for assistance. Each peer observation report is to include:
- Number and title of course observed, if applicable
- Date of report
- Date of observation
- Description of methods by which instructor engages students in learning
- Date on which the observation was discussed with the candidate
- Constructive advice
- Any specific improvement from previous peer observation reports
- Name and signature of observer(s)

Resources offered by UT Austin's Center for Teaching and Learning regarding Peer Review of Teaching may be found here: https://ctl.utexas.edu/peer-observation

E.14.13 Selected Instructional Materials (Teaching Portfolio)
Required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty. The candidate is to include selectively chosen examples of instructional or curricular materials appropriate for a teaching portfolio, such as syllabi, handouts, problem sets, and other written materials developed for courses; computer-assisted instructional aids; examinations. These materials do not accompany the dossier beyond the dean's office. If the candidate mentions a specific course or material that was disseminated to students in their candidate statement for Educational Leadership, it is best to include a copy of it in this section. Provide a table of contents (as cover sheet to this section) with brief annotations of each item listed.

E.14.14 Selected Clinical Innovations (if applicable)
The candidate may include selectively chosen examples of materials, clinical innovations or other scholarly work and summarize (one page or less) the impact of these works on the mission of Dell Medical School. Provide a table of contents (as cover sheet to this section) with brief annotations of each item listed.

E.14.15 Patient Outcomes (if applicable)
If available and applicable, it is recommended that the candidate include patient outcome information.

E.14.16 Additional Materials Requested by Secondary Academic Unit (FOLDER)
If applicable (i.e., the candidate holds a joint appointment of at least 30%) this folder should be used to contain materials required by the non-primary joint appointment unit (department, college, school).

E.14.17 Optional Impact of Professional Disruptions Statement
Candidates have the discretion to include an Impact of Professional Disruptions Statement (limited to two pages) in their dossier and the materials may be distributed to reviewers, if applicable. The Statement must adhere to the [Guidelines for the Impact of Professional Disruptions Statement.](#)

E.14.18 Other Supplemental Materials
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. Provide a table of contents (as cover sheet to this section) with brief annotations of each item listed.

Required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty: Candidate will create a PDF/screenshot of the "Results" page that pertains to their iCite link and include this page in the Other Supplemental Materials folder. For more guidance on this, please see the instructions for NIH mean RCR index on the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage.

If a candidate wishes to update their CV after promotion review has already started, then they must put the updated CV in the Other Supplemental Materials folder. **Recommended updates include information on grants, publications, etc. that have become available since the file was compiled and submitted for review**. The CV must be dated, and updates must be highlighted.

Section F: Outcomes

F.1 President Conferences
The president's review committee will review and discuss the promotion dossiers. The dean will attend a promotion review meeting with the president's review committee to discuss the work of the candidates from the Dell Medical School. In some cases, the president may request additional information to make a decision that is in the best interest of the University (e.g., an update of accomplishments in rank from the candidate, formal assessment of a candidate's contributions and achievements from additional experts in the field, consultation with key University stakeholders to address questions that have not been resolved within the dossier or during the conference with the dean, etc.).

F.2 Announcement of Decisions

The Office of the President will formally notify the dean of the results of the promotion conferences, including those pending cases where an action of terminal appointment is being considered. Candidates will be notified of the president's decision in February 2027.

F.3 Final Arguments in Terminal Appointment Pending Cases

Tenure-track candidates who receive notice of a terminal appointment pending <u>or</u> notice of an outcome that involves moving to the professional-track may present final arguments in writing to the president before the case is decided. Final arguments provide candidates with 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 the provost via https://ut.service-now.com/evpp by a date to be determined in 2027.

The president will refer the written arguments to the dean and department chair for comment and to members of the president's review committee for review and discussion, prior to making a final decision.

F.4 ~~**Request for Review by the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom & Responsibility (CCAFR)**~~

Per Senate Bill (SB) 37, the Faculty Council for The University of Texas at Austin, and thereby the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR), is dissolved as of September 1, 2025. When this information is updated by The University of Texas at Austin, an amendment will be added to this document.

F.5 Reconsideration of a Tenure Decision in the Terminal Year

Reconsideration of a tenure decision <u>may not</u> be requested for tenure-track faculty that receive notice of an outcome that involves moving from the tenure-track to the professional-track. Reconsideration of a tenure decision in the terminal year may be requested <u>only</u> for tenure-track faculty that receive notice of a terminal appointment after promotion and tenure review. The University has no obligation to provide a faculty member with reconsideration of a tenure decision during a terminal year, however, a department chair, or dean may request reconsideration based on submission of substantial new evidence by the candidate. The executive committee and APT Committee are responsible for assessing whether the latest evidence of productivity presented by a candidate is substantial and sufficiently compelling to merit reconsideration of the decision. Such a review must examine any evidence not previously considered to determine whether the new evidence clearly demonstrates that the decision made the previous academic 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 dossier that focuses on the new evidence and submit this, along with the previous year's dossier, to each level in the review process. The executive committee shall prepare an assessment of the new evidence put forward in each area of review. Reconsideration of tenure-track cases in a terminal year does not progress beyond the department level unless the executive committee votes to support (a voting outcome by the committees qualifies as 'support' for a recommended action if at least 50% of eligible voters on the committee votes are in favor of the recommendation) and the department chair recommends promotion.

Reconsideration during the terminal appointment year does not entitle a candidate to an additional terminal year if the promotion case is unsuccessful.

F.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 and Regents' Rule 31008 (as applicable).

F.7 Resources

- For assistance with the UT Austin promotion and tenure process generally: Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost at https://ut.service-now.com/evpp.
- For assistance specific to these Guidelines and the Dell Medical School: Office of Faculty Academic Affairs at: dellmedfacultyaffairs@austin.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 (CCAFR).~~
  Per Senate Bill (SB) 37, the Faculty Council for The University of Texas at Austin, and thereby the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR), is dissolved as of September 1, 2025.
  When this information is updated by The University of Texas at Austin, an amendment will be added to this document.
- ~~For questions about the Faculty Grievance Procedure:~~ ~~Faculty Grievance Committee~~
  Per Senate Bill (SB) 37, the Faculty Council for The University of Texas at Austin, and thereby the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR), is dissolved as of September 1, 2025.
  When this information is updated by The University of Texas at Austin, an amendment will be added to this document.

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

The UT Austin Handbook of Operating Procedures, the UT System Regents' Rules, state and federal law, take precedence over these Guidelines. Note that if a policy in the relevant UT Austin Handbook of Operating Procedures is under revision, then the candidate and reviewers should address questions to the provost's Faculty Affairs team at https://ut.service-now.com/evpp.

Section G: Appendix

G.1 Table 1. List of Possible Outcomes by Rank/Track

Table 1. List of Possible Outcomes by Rank/Track
Possible Outcomes for Mandatory Review of Tenure-Track Assistant Professor: • Be promoted to associate professor with tenure; or • Be promoted to associate professor and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or • Remain at the assistant professor rank and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or • Be placed on a terminal appointment for the next year.
Possible Outcomes for Accelerated Review of Tenure-Track Assistant Professor: • Be promoted to associate professor with tenure; or • Be promoted to associate professor and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or • Remain at the assistant professor rank and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or • Be denied promotion and remain a tenure-track assistant professor until mandatory review year; or • Be placed on a terminal appointment for the next year.
Possible Outcomes for Mandatory Review for promotion and tenure of Tenure-Track Associate Professor: • Award tenure in the rank of associate professor; or • Be promoted to professor with tenure; or • Be promoted to professor and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or • Remain at the associate professor rank and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or • Be placed on a terminal appointment for the next year.
Possible Outcomes for Mandatory Review for only award of tenure of Tenure-Track Associate Professor: • Award tenure in the rank of associate professor; or • Remain at the associate professor rank and be moved to a professional-track appointment; or • Be placed on a terminal appointment for the next year.
Possible Outcomes for Mandatory Review of Tenure-Track Professor: • Be awarded tenure in the rank of professor; • Remain at the professor rank and be moved to a professional- track appointment; • Be placed on a terminal appointment for the next year.
Possible Outcomes for Associate Professor with Tenure (all cases including accelerated cases): • Be promoted to professor with tenure; • Be denied promotion to professor with tenure.

G.2 Summary of Dossier Preparation – Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Instructions:
Please follow the file naming convention below. Please do not include the candidate's name in the file names. These will be organized inside a UT Box folder with the candidate's name.

When uploading files to UT Box, please be sure to only upload one version of each document. If you have to upload more than one version, you will need to clear out the extra versions before submitting to the Office of Faculty Academic Affairs. To avoid this, delete the old version from the Box file before uploading a new version.

DOSSIER FOLDER

PDF File Name in UT Box	PDF Document Contents
01_Dean Statement.pdf	Statement from Dean • Office of Faculty Academic Affairs will upload to the dossier.
02_Chair Statement.pdf	Statement from Department Chair of Primary Department
03a,b,c_Other Statement_CSU Title.pdf	Statement from the joint, courtesy, or other Department Chair/Center Director (if applicable) • Statements from joint or courtesy Department Chairs should appear before statements from other departments.
04_CV.pdf	• Updated CV using Dell Med CV template from the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage.
05_Educational Leadership.pdf	• Executive Committee Statement with typed names of and signatures of all committee members. • Candidate Statement (4 pages or less. Does not have to be signed.) • Summary of Instructional Activities • Honors and Awards **Please note**: learner evaluations, teaching certifications, and selected instructional materials go in the Supplemental Materials folder.
06_Clinical Expertise.pdf	• Executive Committee Statement with typed names of and signatures of all committee members. • Candidate Statement (4 pages or less. Does not have to be signed.) • Summary of Clinical Activities • Honors and Awards

07_Investigation and Inquiry.pdf	• Executive Committee Statement with typed names of and signatures of all committee members. • Candidate Statement (4 pages or less. Does not have to be signed. **Must include NIH mean RCR index .**) • List of Five Most Significant Works Completed in Rank: Tenure-track and tenured candidates must identify the five most significant works completed in rank and provide a list using the List of Five Most Significant Works template from the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage. • Summary of External Research Grants • Honors and Awards
08_Academic and Professional Service.pdf	• Executive Committee Statement with typed names of and signatures of all committee members. • Candidate Statement (4 pages or less. Does not have to be signed.) • Summary of Administrative and Professional Service Activities • Honors and Awards
09_Summary of Reviewers.pdf	• Grouped by Received, Declined, and No Response • Reviewers listed in alphabetical order by last name within each group. Use the Summary of Reviewers template from the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage.
10a,b,c_ltr_Last name-Institution.pdf	• Place individual letters in alphabetical order by last name. • Each letter should include a header in upper right-hand corner of the first page that indicates whether the Candidate, Executive Committee, or Chair nominated the external reviewer. This information must match what is listed on the Summary of Reviewers. • Each letter should include CV of external reviewer.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS FOLDER

This is a separate folder that should only be created if applicable.

PDF File Name in UT Box	PDF Document Contents
01_Additional Statement_ccyy-dd-mm_Last Name.pdf	• Any non-required statements or information added to the file as a result of the candidate's review or received during the course of the review process. • The last name in the file name refers to who wrote the statement, i.e. Chair or Candidate. • All statements must include the date the information was added to the dossier.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS FOLDER

PDF File Name in UT Box	PDF Document Contents
01_Mid-Probationary Review Summary.pdf	Copy of Mid-Probationary Review Summary • Only applicable for tenure-track candidates • Office of Faculty Academic Affairs will upload to the dossier.
02_Comprehensive Periodic Review Report	Copy of Comprehensive Periodic Review Report • Only applicable for associate professors with tenure that have undergone comprehensive periodic review at UT Austin. • Office of Faculty Academic Affairs will upload to the dossier.
03_Five Most Significant Works Completed in Rank (FOLDER) File naming convention: 01_List of five significant works 02_Short_title for first significant work through 06_Short_title for the fifth significant work	• Required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty. • PDF describing the five most significant works created using the List of Five Most Significant Works template from the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage. • Texts of each of the five most significant works: the full text of the five most significant works completed in rank must be included as separated PDFs.
04_Sample Solicitation Letter	• PDF of Sample of Solicitation Letter/Email sent to reviewer.
05_List of Materials Sent to Reviewer	• List of all materials that were sent to the reviewer. All materials that were sent to the reviewers (except the CV) will be included here. • **Please note:** CV can be listed as material sent to reviewer. But DO NOT include CV in this PDF.

06_Correspondence from External Reviewers Who Did Not Provide an Evaluation	• All declinations correspondence placed in alphabetical order by last name (if received). CV is not required.
07_Correspondence from Reviewers Received after Executive Committee Review	• Letters from external reviewers received after executive committee review must be included in this folder in alphabetical order by last name. • Each letter should include a header in upper right-hand corner of the first page that indicates whether the Candidate, Executive Committee, or Chair nominated the external reviewer. This information must match what is listed on the Summary of Reviewers. • Each letter should include CV of external reviewer.
08_Letters Solicited from Collaborators.pdf	• Chart of collaborators listed in alphabetical order by last name. • Can use the Summary of Reviewers template from the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage. • All solicited letters placed in alphabetical order by last name after the chart of collaborators. CV is not required.
09_Letters Solicited from Mentees.pdf	• Chart of mentees listed in alphabetical order by last name. • Can use the Summary of Reviewers template from the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage. • All solicited letters placed in alphabetical order by last name after the chart of mentees. CV is not required.
10_a,b,c_Learner Evaluations_(Medical Student, Resident, Fellow, CME).pdf	• Learner evaluations from medical students, residents, fellows, CME. • Each PDF should include a header in upper right-hand corner of the first page that indicates the type of learner evaluation: medical student, resident, fellow, CME, etc.
11_a,b,c_Student Comments_Semester NameYY-Course#.pdf	• Each set of student comments should be separate PDF document.
12_Peer Observation of Teaching.pdf	• Peer Observation of Teaching reports while in rank.
13_Selected Instructional Materials.pdf	• Copy of Teaching Portfolio: selectively chosen examples of instructional or curricular materials. • Required for all tenured and tenure-track faculty. • Should include a table of contents with very brief description/relevance of items.

14_Selected Clinical Innovations.pdf	• Examples of materials, clinical innovations, or other scholarly works. • Should include a table of contents with very brief description/relevance of items.
15_Patient Outcomes	• If available and applicable, the candidate may include patient outcome information.
16_Additional Materials Requested by Secondary Academic Unit (FOLDER)	• If applicable, this folder should be used to contain materials required by the non-primary joint appointment unit.
17_Impact of Professional Disruptions Statement	• Optional: Impact of Professional Disruption Statement
18_Other Supplemental Materials.pdf	• Items submitted by the candidate. • Should include a table of contents with very brief description/relevance of items. • Certificates from completed courses, if applicable. • Required for all tenure and tenure-track faculty: PDF/screenshot of the "Results" page that pertains to candidate's iCite link. For more guidance, please see the instructions for NIH mean RCR index on the Dell Med Office of Faculty Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure webpage. • CV updates, if applicable.