

2026-27 - PROFESSIONAL-TRACK FACULTY PROMOTION POLICY

Approved: EOT Approval on November 3, 2025

Approved: EVPP Approval on October 22, 2025

Policy Effective Date: November 3, 2025

Revised October 2025

Table of Contents

A.	Expectations	3
B.	Track and Title Series Designation	3
C.	Changing Title Series within the Professional-Track	3
D.	Professional-Track Faculty	4
E.	Scholarship	4
1.	Professional-Track, Professor Title Series	4
2.	Professional-Track, Clinical Professor Title Series	5
F.	Areas of Excellence	5
1.	Clinical Expertise	5
2.	Educational Leadership	5
3.	Investigation and Inquiry	5
G.	Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise	5
H.	Evaluation of Additional Contributions	6
1.	Clinical Expertise	6
2.	Educational Leadership	6
3.	Investigation and Inquiry	6
4.	Academic and Professional Service	6
I.	Managing Joint Appointments	7
J.	Timing of Review	8
1.	Readiness for and Initiating Promotion Review	9
2.	Procedures	9

3.	Invoking The Right of Consideration to be a Candidate for Promotion Review	10
4.	Effective Years in Rank	11
5.	Minimum Amount of Qualifying Service at UT Austin	11
6.	Electing to Combine Service at UT Austin with Time Worked at Prior Institution(s)	11
7.	Sample Timelines for On-Time Promotion Review	11
8.	Accelerated Review	12
K.	Status of Continuing Appointment	12
L.	Title-Specific Expectations	13
1.	Promotions in the Professor Title Series	13
2.	Promotions in the Clinical Professor Title Series	13
M.	Possible Outcomes Following Consideration for Promotion	14
1.	President Conferences	14
2.	Announcement of Decisions	15
3.	Request for Review by the Procedural Concerns in Faculty Review (PCFR) Cohort	15
4.	Grievances	16
5.	Resources	16

A. Expectations

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 professional-track faculty to be active scholars with vital contributions in their respective areas of contribution which may include 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.

B. Track and Title Series Designation

Regular faculty will be designated as tenured, tenure-track, or professional-track at the time of their initial appointment, and for professional-track faculty, their appointments will be designated as either the clinical professor title series or the professor title series. These designations will be documented in each faculty member's initial written letter of appointment.

For professional-track faculty appointed after November 1, 2023, the title series is designated at the time of the initial faculty appointment. Faculty appointed to the professional-track prior to this date were appointed to the professor title series because the clinical title series did not exist and if they should be in the clinical title series, their title series may be designated by the department chair/department chair designee at two time points: (1) at the time of the annual faculty evaluation and (2) when the faculty member is preparing to be considered for promotion.

C. Changing Title Series within the Professional-Track

Title series *changes* are distinct from *designation of title series*. Upon discussion with and approval by the department chair, professional-track faculty may change title series within the professional-track when the promotion process is being initiated (prior to the department soliciting internal/external letters for a faculty promotion dossier).

Professional-track faculty members in the rank of assistant or associate professor may be moved to the professional-track clinical professor title series, if merited, as evidenced by the fundamental philosophy, principles, and expectations for faculty promotion as outlined for this professional-track title series.

Professional-track faculty members in the rank of clinical assistant or clinical associate professor

may be moved to the professional-track professor title series, if merited, as evidenced by the fundamental philosophy, principles and expectations for faculty promotion as outlined for this professional-track title series.

D. Professional-Track Faculty

Dell Medical School's professional-track is meant to provide a pathway for educators, clinicians and research scientists to be recognized for their scholarly work, expertise, and contributions to the school and University. Dell Medical School supports and encourages its faculty in these activities, recognizing that most of its faculty will have clinical or other obligations that make progression on the tenure-track impracticable. Professional-track faculty are the backbone of the medical school's teaching, education, clinical, and community service missions who the school wishes to recognize through attainment of and progression through professional-track academic rank outside of the traditional expectations of the tenure-track process.

E. Scholarship

The Dell Medical School requires professional-track faculty to be active in scholarship as defined below. Scholarship is broadly defined as the creation and/or dissemination of new knowledge. We have adopted Boyer's model of scholarship (Boyer, E. L. (1990), *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching) that expands from traditional research, or the scholarship of discovery, to a broader definition that is more flexible. Boyer's four categories are:

- The scholarship of **discovery** that involves original research that advances knowledge (i.e., basic research);
- The scholarship of **integration** that seeks to interpret, analyze, and/or connect original research or creative work. It involves the synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics within a discipline, or across time (i.e., review articles, book chapters, interprofessional education, science communication, clinical integration across disciplines and professions, or development of regional or national guidelines);
- The scholarship of **application** / engagement that involves the rigor and application of disciplinary expertise (i.e., cooperative state research, education, service on regional or national committees, leadership in professional societies, invited lectures, recognition as a clinical expert); and
- The scholarship of **teaching** and learning that involves the systematic study of teaching and learning processes. It differs from scholarly teaching in that it requires a format that will allow public sharing and the opportunity for application and evaluation by others.

Requirements of these expanded models of scholarship are that they go beyond the service duties of a faculty member to those within or outside the University and that their results can be shared with, applied, and/or evaluated by peers.

1. Professional-Track, Professor Title Series

Faculty appointed to this title series are expected to play an active and sustained key role in a program of scholarship in an area of expertise, which includes traditional outputs of scholarship (e.g., peer-reviewed publications) in the designated Area of Excellence and garners a reputation beyond the University.

2. Professional-Track, Clinical Professor Title Series

Faculty appointed to this title series are expected to demonstrate active participation in the academic mission of Dell Medical School and active engagement in scholarly activities that derive from and support clinical, teaching, and/or professional service activities. Scholarship is defined broadly and peer-reviewed publications are not required.

F. Areas of Excellence

The Dell Medical School defines four 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. Professional-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 their Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise that do not fall under their designated Area of Excellence.

Evidence of clinical expertise is required of all faculty engaged in clinical care, either as the designated Area of Excellence or as a part of Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise. Clinical expertise is reviewed only for faculty who provide clinical services.

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.

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.

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.

G. Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise

A record of and evidence supporting a future trajectory of excellence in terms of active, Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise more generally must also be clearly demonstrated and is reviewed. The Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise might be made at the intersection of one or more of the Areas of Review.

Activities in the area of Academic and Professional Service that faculty are engaged in that do not fall within their designated Area of Excellence must be included as a part of Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise.

For faculty engaged in clinical care who do not have Clinical Expertise as their designated Area of

Excellence, their clinical activities must be included as a part of Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise. Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise offered by the candidate cannot repeat use of accomplishments and performance in the Area of Excellence.

H. Evaluation of Additional Contributions

1. Clinical Expertise

Evidence of expertise and scholarship in a clinical discipline and contributions to clinical practice that are of high quality and significance, including contributions and/or policies that measurably improved the quality and value of patient outcomes and/or population health. A record of leadership in professional societies, membership on editorial boards, development of significant protocols, policies, or technologies, or external recognition or awards received for clinical excellence and/or population or public health is also considered.

2. Educational Leadership

Evidence of expertise and scholarship in teaching and curricular contributions that are of high quality and significance. Teaching may involve medical students, undergraduate and graduate students, residents, fellows, colleagues, and/or learners from other disciplines, and may take a variety of formats, including didactics, precepting, seminars, and clinical supervision. Demonstration of excellence in mentoring and excellent learner evaluations are expected. A record of invited lectureships, leadership in educational societies or committees, peer-reviewed publications, educational materials developed and used by other institutions, or external recognition or awards received for education, teaching, and mentorship are also considered.

3. Investigation and Inquiry

Evidence of expertise in research and scholarly work that is of high quality and significance. Work may focus on laboratory, population-based, clinical, health services, or educational investigations, resulting in the production of scholarly work that has been published in peer-reviewed journals and the demonstration of a financially sustainable line of investigation. A record of local, regional, national, and/or international invited presentations, external recognition or awards for research, service as an editor and/or on editorial boards of scientific journals, service on regional, national, and international committees related to research including grant review panels is also considered.

4. Academic and Professional Service

Academic and Professional Service is not an Area of Excellence, but activities in this area that do not fall within the candidate's Area of Excellence are reviewed as a part of additional contributions to the academic enterprise.

Academic service is broadly defined as participation in service to the division, department, school, and/or university. Examples include serving on committees, advising students, and involvement or leadership of initiatives to support division, departmental, school, and/or university needs.

Professional service is broadly defined as service to the field or discipline. Examples of

professional service include participation in and/or leadership on professional society or field-related committees, boards, panels, etc.; organization of conferences, courses, workshops, or symposia related to the field or discipline, and peer or editorial review for journals.

I. 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.

The department chair (or dean in a non-departmentalized college/school) corresponding to the candidate's primary appointment is responsible for notifying the supervisor (chair, director, dean) of the candidate's joint appointment that the candidate might be being put forward for promotion review.

1. Professional-track faculty with joint appointments with another college and/or school at the University.

In most cases, professional-track faculty with joint appointments with another college and/or school at the University must be reviewed simultaneously in each college and/or school in which they hold an appointment, independent of the percent appointment. However, the dean of the college/school in which the candidate has their primary academic appointment may submit a request to the Faculty Affairs team in the Provost's Office for the candidate to be reviewed only in that college/school.

(a) Candidates Reviewed in Multiple Colleges/Schools

Each academic unit in which the faculty member holds an appointment in rank (excluding courtesy appointments) at the time of review must conduct an independent review of the candidate at all levels (Section J.1).

The department chair (or dean in a non-departmentalized college/school) corresponding to the candidate's primary appointment is responsible for coordinating with the department chair/dean corresponding to the candidate's other (joint) appointment(s) for the development of the dossier, including: (1) selection and solicitation of internal and/or external reviewers, if relevant, and (2) selection of the ad hoc committee charged with writing the required BC/EC statement for each area of review. Note that the faculty members assigned to write each of the BC/EC statements must represent all academic units in which the faculty member held appointments.

A single dossier is prepared for the candidate. If the school or college corresponding to the primary or joint appointment require additional materials for the promotion review, those materials are included in the dossier (*Additional Materials Requested by Secondary Academic Unit*).

(b) Candidates Reviewed in One College/School

If the Faculty Affairs Team in the Provost's Office has approved that the candidate be reviewed in only one college/school, the dean or department chair of the primary unit reviewing the candidate may request the following information from the other academic unit(s) in which the

candidate is appointed: (a) input regarding selection of reviewers (if relevant), (b) participation by eligible faculty in writing the required BC/EC statements, and (c) a letter from the department chair or dean evaluating the faculty member's contributions to the other academic unit(s).

The outcome of the promotion review will affect all of the faculty member's current appointments (e.g., if the faculty member is promoted, then their faculty rank will change for all of the appointments that they hold rather than just the appointment(s) in the unit(s) that conducted the review). See also the [UT Austin General Guidelines for Promotion Review of Professional-Track Faculty](#) and the table below (section J.7) for guidance.

2. Professional-track faculty holding a joint appointment between departments within the Dell Medical School

(a) 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 reviewers, (b) participation by eligible faculty in writing the required executive committee statements (if applicable), and (c) optional contributions that may be added to the supplemental materials section of the dossier.

(b) Joint Appointment within the Dell Medical School of at Least 30%

Faculty members in the Professor title series holding a joint appointment of at least 30% must be reviewed by an ad hoc committee with membership corresponding to both the primary and joint appointments. (Faculty members in the Clinical Professor title series are not reviewed at the executive committee/ad hoc committee level.)

Regardless of the title series, the department chair will conduct an independent review 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 reviewers, and (2) if applicable, 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.

J. Timing of Review

Faculty promotion is based on excellence in performance and scholarship. Candidate performance will be based on pre-established metrics of success set by the medical school, and scholarship is defined broadly as the creation and/or dissemination of new knowledge through

discovery, integration, application, or teaching. Promotion requires a formal review of the candidate's achievements, including an assessment of the candidate's success in accomplishing their duties, the impact and the quality of the contributions, and/or specific services rendered, as demonstrated by the candidate's body of work, letters of evaluation, and the evaluations from students, residents, patients and peers, if applicable.

1. Readiness for and Initiating Promotion Review

Readiness for promotion review will be determined by the department chair or designee. Discussions between faculty members and the department chair or their designee should occur each year during the annual evaluation process that is required for all faculty members.

Professional-track faculty may be reviewed for promotion as early as their sixth effective year in rank. Promotion review prior to their sixth year in rank would be considered accelerated. There is no mandatory review for professional-track faculty, so the timing of promotion review may occur later than the sixth effective year in rank.

Professional-track faculty may be considered for promotion during any year deemed appropriate by the executive committee or equivalent governing committee, department chair of their department, the Dell Medical School APT Committee, and dean. (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.)

A faculty member is officially a candidate for promotion once external or internal reviews for promotion have been solicited. At that point, all promotion candidates have the right for their promotion case to progress through all levels of review at the University and only the candidate may withdraw a case before consideration by the president's committee. 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 J.3) Invoking the Right of Consideration to be a Candidate for Promotion Review.

2. Procedures

Promotion within the regular faculty structure requires a formal review of the candidate's credentials, including an assessment of the candidate's success in accomplishing their duties, the impact and the quality of the contributions, and/or specific services rendered, and the evaluations of students, residents, patients and peers, if applicable. The department chair, or designee, will be responsible for counseling individual faculty members on career development and preparation during their evaluations and throughout the year for ongoing mentorship and promotion. The department chair, or designee, will meet annually with each faculty member to discuss accomplishments during the previous year, responsibilities, and expectations for the coming year. At this time the faculty member's career goals and progress towards promotion and any evaluations on the faculty are reviewed.

Typically, the chair of the department, the division director, or the departmental executive committee initiates the request for promotion but initiation of the request for promotion may also occur by individual faculty through a direct request to the department chair.

Promotion review will be achieved through a multi-step process that is initiated upon

recommendation of the department chair to the Dell Medical School Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee. The dean reviews and provides their assessment and recommendation to the President's Review Committee. Recommendations are made to the president for review and appropriate action.

Promotion review for Professional-Track faculty of the Dell Medical School follows a triannual review process wherein there are three separate "review cycles" in which the faculty may be reviewed. Review during a cycle begins with initiation of request for promotion and proceeds with formal review through all levels at the University. For detailed information on the scheduled triannual review cycles for the academic year, please see the Faculty Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure page on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs webpage.

For detailed information on roles and responsibilities of the candidate, committees, and department chair, as well as instructions for dossier assembly, please see the 2026-27 Dell Medical School Guidelines for Promotion for Professional-Track Faculty on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs webpage.

Information for faculty who hold joint appointments between the Dell Medical School and another college or school at the University can be found in the [UT Austin General Guidelines for Promotion Review of Professional-Track Faculty](#).

3. Invoking The Right of Consideration to be a Candidate for Promotion Review

Except when subject to restrictions imposed as discipline for misconduct, professional-track faculty members may invoke their right to be considered for promotion during the tenth or later effective year in rank, after completing at least two full academic years in service in the same rank at the University.

In the case of a denied promotion or if the candidate withdraws their dossier from consideration after the departmental executive committee review, the candidate may be considered for promotion during any subsequent review cycle deemed appropriate by the department chair. When not subject to restrictions imposed as discipline or misconduct, the professional-track faculty candidate may again invoke their right to be considered for promotion review following completion of a minimum of five additional full academic years of service. The first year of this five-year count starts in the first academic year after the negative promotion decision.

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 professional-track faculty candidate must advise their department chair of their request to be considered for promotion.

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](#).

4. Effective Years in Rank

Promotion to associate professor requires six effective years of service in rank at assistant professor, and promotion to professor requires six effective years of service in rank at associate professor in order to be considered an on-time promotion. Promotion effective dates for professional-track faculty are dependent upon the cycle in which the candidate is reviewed.

Professional-track faculty accrue one effective year in rank at UT Austin when at least nine months of full-time academic service have been completed during the University’s academic year (September 1 – August 31). An academic year does not count as an effective year in rank if the professional-track faculty member has an approved personal circumstances flag associated with that year.

If a professional-track faculty member is laterally reclassified from one professional-track title series to another during their career at UT Austin, then the number of effective years in rank is not reset at the time of a reclassification. Therefore, a faculty member with three effective years in rank as an Assistant Professor of Medicine and three effective years in rank as a Clinical Assistant Professor of Medicine has accumulated six effective years in rank.

5. Minimum Amount of Qualifying Service at UT Austin

All candidates for promotion must complete a minimum of two effective years in rank at UT Austin before the start of the academic year in which their promotion case is reviewed.

6. Electing to Combine Service at UT Austin with Time Worked at Prior Institution(s)

Candidates who were appointed as a professional-track (or equivalent) faculty member at the equivalent rank at one or more other institutions immediately prior to their appointment as a professional-track faculty member at UT Austin may elect to combine effective years in rank at UT Austin with no more than three full years of service at the other institution(s) to satisfy the requirements for on-time promotion. In addition, the candidate must satisfy the minimum required effective years in rank at UT Austin.

The candidate must inform (by email) their department chair and the Dell Medical School Office of Faculty Academic Affairs that they have elected to be considered under the combined service option. The Dell Medical School Office of Faculty Academic Affairs will then send the request to the Provost’s Office.

The candidate’s record of combined service will be evaluated using the same expectations as if the candidate had completed all effective years in rank at UT Austin. And promoting a faculty member must be in the best interest of the department, school, and University.

7. Sample Timelines for On-Time Promotion Review

Table 1. Professional-Track Faculty

	No Joint Appointment or Joint Appointment within the Dell Medical School	Joint Appointment with Another College or School at the University
Year of Dossier Prep	5 th year in rank	5 th year in rank
Year of Review	6 th year in rank	6 th year in rank
Year promotion is effective	Promotion effective dates are in the 6 th year in rank (the specific effective date is dependent upon the cycle in which the candidate is reviewed)	September 1 of 7 th year in rank
There is no mandatory review for professional-track faculty, so that timing of promotion review may occur later than the years indicated above. Promotion review prior to the timelines above is considered accelerated. Promotion effective date for positions outside of the Dell Medical School will be August 16th of 7th year in rank.		

8. Accelerated Review

Any promotion review case, including an accelerated promotion review case, cannot be considered sooner than after the candidate has completed at least two full academic years of qualifying service in rank at UT Austin before the start of the academic year in which their promotion case is reviewed. Cases that are reviewed prior to the year designated for an on-time review are accelerated.

Accelerated cases must be fully explained and justified by the dean and department chair and should only be put forward for review when a compelling case can be made so that the candidate's record and potential for continuing excellence is truly exceptional in their designated Area of Excellence and in their Additional Contributions to the Academic Enterprise, and that accelerated promotion is in the University's best interest.

In most cases, the University will benefit from the evidence gathered from fulfillment of the minimum of six years of effective years in rank or of elected combined service to satisfy an on-time review prior to making a promotion decision because this information offers more consistent and reliable evidence to demonstrate a continuing trajectory of excellence in the professional context and environment of UT Austin.

K. Status of Continuing Appointment

No professional-track member of the faculty should expect continuing appointment beyond the term of their current appointment. The possibility of contract renewal is based upon successful evaluation each year and the needs of the program. In contrast to the tenure-track faculty, there is no expectation that professional-track faculty must progress up the academic ranks. However, there is a strong expectation that professional-track faculty continue to contribute to

the school's mission throughout their appointment. Their ongoing contributions are assessed on an annual basis within their respective departments.

L. Title-Specific Expectations

Candidates must demonstrate success relative to the following expectations in order to be ready for promotion review. In all cases, academic, licensure, and board credentials congruent with the expectations of a research-intensive university, school and department and the individual's assigned responsibilities are required.

1. Promotions in the Professor Title Series

a. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:

- Evidence of peer recognition reflected by an emerging regional or statewide reputation as a clinician, educator, and/or researcher and a major contributor to their field of expertise.
- Evidence of a track record and strong trajectory of scholarly achievement, including peer-reviewed publications, reflected in peer recognition of works from original research, clinical observations, educational programs, etc.
- Evidence of excellence in training, teaching, and advising of undergraduate, medical and graduate students, residents, clinical and postdoctoral research fellows, or colleagues, if applicable.
- Evidence of excellent clinical skills and patient satisfaction, clinical innovations, clinical research and/or programs that are regionally distinguished, if applicable.
- Evidence of participation in programs that measurably improve patient outcomes and development of new clinical approaches and innovation in specialty, if available.

b. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor:

- Evidence of peer recognition derived from a sustained regional or statewide reputation and emerging national reputation as a top clinician and/or educator and/or researcher in the field of expertise.
- Sustained scholarly achievement, including peer-reviewed publications, reflected in peer recognition of works from original research, clinical observations, educational programs, etc.
- Sustained evidence of excellence in training, teaching, and advising of undergraduate, medical and graduate students, residents, clinical and postdoctoral research fellows, or colleagues, if applicable.
- Sustained evidence of excellent clinical skills and patient satisfaction, clinical innovations, clinical research and/or programs that are regionally and nationally distinguished, if applicable.
- Sustained evidence of participation in programs that measurably improve patient outcomes and development of new clinical approaches and innovation in specialty, if available.

2. Promotions in the Clinical Professor Title Series

a. Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor:

- Evidence of active, sustained participation in academic missions of Dell Medical School.
- Evidence of participation in scholarly activities that derive from and support clinical, teaching, and professional service activities. Scholarship is defined broadly and peer-

reviewed publications are not required.

- Evidence of excellence in training, teaching, and advising of undergraduate, medical and graduate students, residents, clinical and postdoctoral research fellows, or colleagues for faculty engaged in teaching.
- Evidence of excellent clinical skills and patient satisfaction, clinical innovations, clinical research and/or programs that are distinguished, if applicable.
- Evidence of participation in programs that measurably improve patient outcomes and development of new clinical approaches and innovation in specialty, if available.

b. Promotion from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor:

- Evidence of active, sustained participation in academic missions of Dell Medical School.
- Evidence of sustained active engagement in scholarly activities that derive from and support clinical, teaching, and professional service activities. Scholarship is defined broadly and peer-reviewed publications are encouraged.
- Sustained evidence of excellence in training, teaching, and advising of undergraduate, medical and graduate students, residents, clinical and postdoctoral research fellows, or colleagues for faculty engaged in teaching.
- Sustained evidence of excellent clinical skills and patient satisfaction, clinical innovations, clinical research and/or programs that distinguished, if applicable.
- Sustained evidence of participation in programs that measurably improve patient outcomes and development of new clinical approaches and innovation in specialty, if available.

Representative examples of evidence of achievement in Areas of Excellence for these ranks for both professional-track title series can be found on the Dell Medical School Office of Faculty and Academic Affairs webpage.

M. Possible Outcomes Following Consideration for Promotion

Upon consideration for promotion, the executive committee(s) or equivalent governing committee(s) (as applicable for title series), department chair(s) of their department(s), the Dell Medical School Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, and dean shall each recommend one of the following outcomes to the administration. The two committees (as applicable for title series) will each record a vote, and the chair and dean will each independently recommend whether the candidate should:

- A. Be promoted in rank; or
- B. Be denied promotion and they remain at the current rank.

The president of the University of Texas at Austin makes the final decision on promotions for all professional-track candidates.

1. President Conferences

The president's review committee will review and discuss the promotion dossiers. Each dean will attend a promotion review meeting with the president's review committee to discuss the work of the candidates from their college/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, key University stakeholders are invited to address questions that have not been resolved within the dossier or during the conference with the dean, etc.).

2. Announcement of Decisions

The Office of the President will formally notify deans of the results of the promotion conferences, including those pending cases where an action of terminal appointment is being considered. Candidates will be notified of the president's decision on specific dates that align with the corresponding triannual review cycle. Please see triannual promotion cycle timelines for professional-track faculty on the Dell Medical School Faculty Academic Affairs webpage.

3. Request for Review by the Procedural Concerns in Faculty Review (PCFR) Cohort

The candidate or the president may request a review of the case by the Procedural Concerns in Faculty Review (PCFR) Cohort based on concerns of material policy and/or procedural violations that impacted the determination. PCFR Cohort review is limited to: whether there were material policy and/or procedural violations that occurred during the course of the promotion and tenure review process. The PCFR cohort shall not review disputes about professional judgments on the merits of the faculty member's record. Violations of academic freedom concerns may be pursued through the Faculty Grievance process set out in [HOP 2-2310](#), but not through the PCFR process. Faculty are strongly encouraged to reach out to the Faculty Ombuds to discuss their concerns before submitting a request for a PCFR cohort review.

A request for review shall include: 1) a description of the specific policy that was violated or procedural requirement that was not met, 2) an explanation of the nature of the policy and/or procedural violation, and 3) a summary of how the policy and/or procedural violation was material to the overall promotion decision. The deadline to file a complaint is four weeks after the faculty member is notified of their denial of tenure or promotion.

Candidates should use the [Procedural Concerns in Faculty Review Request Form](#) to submit a request for review by the PCFR cohort. The Faculty Affairs team in the Provost's Office will distribute copies of the request to the dean and department chair.

The PCFR cohort will be comprised of at least six tenured faculty members chosen by the president and provost from the president's Faculty Advisory Cohort (FAC). The president and provost will also select a PCFR chair who will manage the administrative organization of the PCFR cohort's assignments including selecting two to three PCFR members to examine a given complaint. Ad hoc FAC members may be added as necessary as determined by the Provost. PCFR cohort members selected to review a specific complaint, will be selected to avoid conflicts of interests, and in general, should not be drawn from the complaining faculty member's college or school. The faculty ombuds and a designee administrator under [HOP 2-2310](#) may be consulted by the PCFR members assigned to examine a specific complaint.

Before proceeding to assign a referred complaint to specific PCFR members for review and advice, the PCFR chair will first examine a referred complaint to confirm it alleges a violation of

policy and/or procedure in the underlying employment review (annual, post-tenure, mid-probationary and promotion and tenure reviews). If the complaint does not raise an alleged policy or procedural complaint, it will be declined for further review and advice by PCFR with a notice of such declination provided to the complaining faculty member with a copy to the referring Provost Office staff. If it is within the scope of PCFR review, the PCFR cohort will review the complaint and any other relevant information, following up with other university personnel as needed to assess the allegations and determine if any material policy or procedural violation occurred. Based on their review, the PCFR cohort will complete a recommendation form that will be referred to the president and provost, with a copy to the faculty member. The president will consider the recommendation form and make a decision regarding whether any further action is necessary or appropriate.

4. 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).

5. 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 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 concerns: [Request for Review by the Procedural Concerns in Faculty Review \(PCFR\) Cohort](#)