Woody L. Hunt College of Business

Promotion and Tenure Guidance
Executive Committee

This document provides guidance regarding the expectations for tenure and/or promotion within the Hunt College of Business at The University of Texas at El Paso.   This document does not supersede existing UTEP or Hunt College policy, as it merely serves to clarify and specify extant policies. The relevant portion of the Handbook of Operating Procedures is available at this link: https://www.utep.edu/hoop/section-3/academic-policies-and-faculty-personnel-matter/4.4-appointment-promotion-tenure-and-termination.html

Expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Tenure
As noted in the Handbook of Operating Procedures, the criteria for appointment as, or promotion to, Associate Professor are similar to those for the granting of tenure and are listed in 4.4.6.1.

The University awards tenure as part of its larger pledge to protect the academic freedom of faculty, regardless of whether their work or ideas are unpopular or controversial. Tenure is an important commitment made only to those faculty members whose performance in research, teaching, and service exceeds the level of satisfactory and who have demonstrated significant potential for continued performance at that high level and for developing new knowledge and practice of national and international significance. The success of Hunt College and University programs depends upon the qualifications of the tenured faculty. Candidates for promotion and tenure must be able to demonstrate how their activities align with the mission of the Department, College, and University. Candidates should be able to address how the development of their portfolio with respect to teaching, research, and service contributes to thought leadership within their discipline and the societal impact of their work. The University's priorities on inclusive excellence should also be addressed in an evidence-based manner in the candidate's portfolio.

Teaching. Faculty candidates must demonstrate effectiveness in teaching through the evaluation of documented evidence along several dimensions. A comprehensive teaching portfolio must include/demonstrate the following:

a. A faculty candidate's summary of teaching efforts, including a self-assessment of teaching performance and an accounting of systematic efforts to achieve teaching excellence.
b. A well-thought-out teaching philosophy statement that aligns with the college's and University's mission to support the learning of all students and outlines the efforts of the faculty member to create a welcoming, inclusive, effective, and rigorous learning environment.
c. Evidence of ability and willingness to teach at all available levels of instruction.
d. Course syllabi that include clearly defined learning objectives, corresponding activities, and assessments that adhere to department-specific criteria associated with the courses.
e. Active participation and support for Assurance of Learning activities associated with AACSB and SACSCOC standards.

f. Rigor appropriate for the level of course as evidenced by the variety and frequency of assessments such as exams, homework assignments, individual and team projects, and other assessments that fully engage learners in the learning process. Integration of an appropriate writing component in courses recognizing the limitations in the case of large classes.
g. Learner evaluations of teaching performance (number of learners enrolled in each class, number of respondents, overall instructor mean, and overall course mean).
h. Grade distributions.
i. Peer reviews of teaching along with documentation on follow-through based on feedback/suggestions made.
j. Breadth and depth of coverage of the subject matter as reflected in the dissemination of both up-to-date disciplinary knowledge and industry expectations.
k. Organization of the course and the quality of delivery.
l. Appropriate use of technology, such as AI in content delivery and the learning process.
m. Accessibility and interaction with learners outside the classroom.
n. Involvement with learner research (undergraduate and graduate), including supervision of capstone projects, thesis, and dissertations, along with membership on thesis and dissertation committees.
o. Inclusion of community-engaged coursework in courses.
p. Number of course preparations and recognition of class sizes.
q. Development of new courses, substantial revisions to existing courses, and/or alternative delivery format for courses (i.e., hybrid, hyflex, or fully online).
r. Participation in on-campus professional development opportunities related to teaching and/or participation and presentations at pedagogical-oriented conferences.
s. Recipient of College/University teaching awards.
t. Recipient of external teaching awards.

Research. Faculty candidates for tenure and/or promotion must produce a research portfolio that demonstrates significant scholarly contributions through the evaluation of documented evidence along several dimensions. The research portfolio must include and/or demonstrate the following:

a. A research statement that discusses the candidate's research interest, publications, and an assessment of the candidate's research impact.
b. Faculty candidates must continually maintain Scholarly Academic status per AACSB standards. No faculty candidate can be considered for promotion and/or tenure unless the SA status is current and is projected to be maintained for at least two years post-review.
c. A history of publication in refereed academic journals or other refereed outlets at a rate appropriate for the discipline. The quality of the published work, as well as the quality of the outlet, is to be judged. There should be no attempt to impose any particular number of contributions necessary for a recommendation for tenure and promotion or to balance the quantity of contributions against quality. In addition, candidates must be able to demonstrate independent work through sole authorship or lead authorship on co-authored peer-reviewed academic journal articles, as well as a diversity of co-authors in collaborative work. Given the College's doctoral-degree-granting status, faculty members

should strive and are expected to publish their papers in top peer-reviewed journals in their respective disciplines.

d. Research scholarship is broadly defined as inclusive of the Scholarship of Discovery, Integration, Application, Teaching, and Engagement, with each form of scholarly contribution considered legitimate in the development of UTEP's scholarly and creative profile. While refereed journal articles are the prime consideration in the evaluation of research, other research output will also be considered to include scholarly books, edited books/volumes, chapters in edited books/volumes, competitive external grant submissions/awards, textbooks, professional conference paper presentations, peer-reviewed conference proceeds, case studies, interdisciplinary peer-review journal articles, and professional practice standards or public policy reports that have undergone a review process. However, such efforts cannot compensate for a weak journal publication record.

e. The importance of the work to the discipline should be judged not only by the departmental faculty but also by the outside evaluators. Each department should solicit six letters from external reviewers for candidates, with a minimum of three (3) letters of evaluation required for the assessment of the candidate's research and scholarship. All returned external reviewer letters received are required to be included in the candidate's tenure and promotion application dossier. Reviewers must be of a rank higher than the one currently held by the candidates and must be employed at universities of a reputation equal to or higher than UTEP. A mix of external review letters from these "reputational" categories would be appropriate. The list must be pre-approved by the dean's office. Department chairs should provide a list of all external reviewers asked to provide an evaluation, even if reviewers did not actually provide a review.

f. In order for a scholarly effort to have made a demonstrable contribution to a discipline, it should have been brought into a public forum by a process that includes peer review and an evaluation of the importance of the work by those in the professional discipline.

g. Routine applications of already accepted knowledge or of theory are not normally considered to be contributions to the advancement of knowledge in the discipline. The distinction between what is and is not a contribution to the advancement of knowledge may, at times, be subtle, but the burden of proof falls on the candidate.

h. A faculty candidate will not be granted promotion and tenure without a clear history of significant contributions to the advancement of knowledge in his or her discipline. The faculty candidate must also be judged to be likely to continue making such contributions for the rest of their career. Therefore, evidence of a strong research pipeline that can sustain a record of effectiveness in research must accompany each application for promotion and/or tenure.

Service. Participation in Department, College, and University service activities is expected of all faculty members; such involvement is not adequate justification for awarding tenure. It is crucial to provide evidence of service leadership and its associated impact on learners, colleagues, the discipline, and the community at large. Faculty candidates must demonstrate effectiveness in service through the evaluation of documented evidence along several dimensions, as outlined below. At a minimum, the service portfolio must include the following:

a. A summary statement of all service activities and their impact on learners, faculty, the University, community, and discipline.
b. A record of participation as a Chair of University, College, and/or Departmental Committees.
c. A record of participation on a University, College, and/or Departmental Committee.
d. Service as an advisor to a student organization.
e. Professional service as a journal editor, journal associate editor, journal editorial board member, and/or journal referee.
f. Service as an external grant reviewer and/or external member of master's theses and doctoral dissertations (other universities).
g. Service on advisory boards outside the University.
h. Leadership or office holding in a professional organization within one's local, state, regional, or national professional organization.
i. Major (non-paid) consultation and service to civic organizations, social agencies, government, business, or industry that is of benefit to the faculty member's teaching, research, or administrative work at UTEP. This refers to individual leadership and initiative on a project that has a significant and lasting impact on the policies or operations of the agency or, in other ways, strengthens the relationship between the College or University and the community it serves.
j. Presentations/speeches (non-paid) at trade or professional meetings (i.e., meetings targeted at what is primarily a non-academic audience).
k. Recipient of College/University service awards.
l. Recipient of external service awards.

Expectations for Promotion to Professor
Promotion to the rank of professor demonstrates not just effectiveness but excellence in multiple evaluation categories with emphasis on sustained high performance, recognition within and outside UTEP, and leadership as evidenced through publications of high quality in discipline-related mainstream journals, extraordinary contributions to teaching above and beyond one's classroom, and high impact service.

Specific examples of excellence in research include publications in widely accepted top journals in one's discipline, grants from major funding sources of significant value in terms of both financial and knowledge-creation value, citations to one's scholarly work, and other intellectual work recognized by reputable external sources as groundbreaking and of high impact.

University-wide, state, regional, and national teaching awards from reputable organizations are examples of evidence of teaching excellence, as is a sustained effort in the scholarship of teaching, the creation of innovative teaching practices, and the active dissemination of best practices in teaching at UTEP as well as at national conferences.

Evidence of service excellence includes significant mentoring activities at all levels of instruction, mentoring of junior faculty members, active participation in the discipline through editorship(s) and membership on editorial boards at reputable journals on the ABDC list (at least B-level journals), leadership in curriculum-related matters such as the creation of new or the revision of

existing academic programs, service on committees with significant, demonstrable and tangible outcomes, and the undertaking of extraordinary service in the community and discipline.

In addition, candidates for promotion to professor must be able to demonstrate how their activities align with the mission of the Department, College, and University levels. Candidates should be able to address how their portfolio with respect to teaching, research, and service contributes to thought leadership within their discipline and the societal impact of their work.

The University's priorities on access and excellence should also be addressed in an evidence-based manner in the candidate's portfolio.

Teaching. Faculty candidates must demonstrate effectiveness in teaching through the evaluation of documented evidence along several dimensions. A comprehensive teaching portfolio must include/demonstrate the following:

a. A faculty candidate's summary of teaching efforts, including a self-assessment of teaching performance and an accounting of systematic efforts to achieve teaching excellence.
b. A well-thought-out teaching philosophy statement that aligns with the college's and University's mission to support the learning of all learners and outlines the efforts of the faculty member to create a welcoming, inclusive, and rigorous learning environment.
c. Evidence of ability and willingness to teach at all available levels of instruction.
d. Course syllabi that include clearly defined learning objectives, corresponding activities, and assessments that adhere to department-specific criteria associated with the courses.
e. Active participation and support for Assurance of Learning activities associated with AACSB standards.
f. Rigor appropriate for the level of course as evidenced by the variety and frequency of assessments such as exams, homework assignments, individual and team projects, and other assessments that fully engage learners in the learning process. Integration of an appropriate writing component in courses recognizing the limitations in the case of large classes.
g. Student evaluations of teaching performance (number of learners enrolled in each class, number of respondents, overall instructor mean, and overall course mean).
h. Grade distributions.
i. Peer reviews of teaching along with documentation on follow-through based on feedback/suggestions made.
j. Breadth and depth of coverage of the subject matter as reflected in the dissemination of both up-to-date disciplinary knowledge and industry expectations.
k. Organization of the course and the quality of delivery.
l. Accessibility and interaction with learners outside the classroom.
m. Involvement with learner research (undergraduate and graduate), including supervision of capstone projects, thesis, and dissertations, along with membership on thesis and dissertation committees).
n. Inclusion of community-engaged coursework in courses.
o. Number of course preparations and recognition of class sizes.

p. Development of new courses, substantial revisions to existing courses, and/or alternative delivery format for courses (i.e., hybrid, hyflex, or fully online).
q. Participation in on-campus professional development opportunities related to teaching and/or participation and presentations at pedagogical-oriented conferences.
r. Recipient of College/University teaching awards.
s. Recipient of external teaching awards.

Faculty candidates for tenure and/or promotion must produce a research portfolio that demonstrates significant scholarly contributions through the evaluation of documented evidence along several dimensions. The research portfolio must include and/or demonstrate the following:

i. A research statement that discusses the candidate's research interest, publications, and an assessment of the candidate's research impact.
j. Faculty candidates must continually maintain Scholarly Academic status per AACSB standards. No faculty candidate can be considered for promotion and/or tenure unless the SA status is current and is projected to be maintained for at least two years post-review.
k. A history of publication in refereed academic journals or other refereed outlets at a rate appropriate for the discipline. The quality of the published work, as well as the quality of the outlet, is to be judged. There should be no attempt to impose any particular number of contributions necessary for a recommendation for tenure and promotion or to balance the quantity of contributions against quality. In addition, candidates must be able to demonstrate independent work through sole authorship or lead authorship on co-authored peer-reviewed academic journal articles, as well as a diversity of co-authors in collaborative work. Given the College's doctoral-degree-granting status, faculty members should strive and are expected to publish their papers in top peer-reviewed journals in their respective disciplines. For example, faculty members should have a publication record consisting of multiple peer-reviewed academic journal articles in the two highest journal categories within their discipline associated with the current ABDC journal ranking (i.e., A* and A publications). Additionally, faculty members should strive to publish their work in traditional top journals in the respective disciplines.
l. Research scholarship is broadly defined as inclusive of the Scholarship of Discovery, Integration, Application, Teaching, and Engagement, with each form of scholarly contribution considered legitimate in the development of UTEP's scholarly and creative profile. While refereed journal articles are the prime consideration in the evaluation of research, other research output will also be considered to include scholarly books, edited books/volumes, chapters in edited books/volumes, competitive external grant submissions/awards, textbooks, professional conference paper presentations, peer-reviewed conference proceeds, case studies, interdisciplinary peer-review journal articles, and professional practice standards or public policy reports that have undergone a review process. However, such efforts cannot compensate for a weak journal publication record.
m. The importance of the work to the discipline should be judged not only by the departmental faculty but also by the outside evaluators. Each department should solicit six letters from external reviewers for candidates, with a minimum of three (3) letters of evaluation required for the assessment of the candidate's research and scholarship. All returned

external reviewer letters received are required to be included in the candidate's tenure and promotion application dossier. Reviewers must be of a rank higher than the one currently held by the candidates and must be employed at universities of a reputation equal to or higher than UTEP. A mix of external review letters from these "reputational" categories would be appropriate. The list must be pre-approved by the dean's office.

n. In order for a scholarly effort to have made a demonstrable contribution to a discipline, it should have been brought into a public forum by a process that includes peer review and an evaluation of the importance of the work by those in the professional discipline.

o. Routine applications of already accepted knowledge or of theory are not normally considered to be contributions to the advancement of knowledge in the discipline. The distinction between what is and is not a contribution to the advancement of knowledge may, at times, be subtle, but the burden of proof falls on the candidate.

p. A faculty candidate will not be granted promotion and tenure without a clear history of significant contributions to the advancement of knowledge in his or her discipline. The faculty candidate must also be judged to be likely to continue making such contributions for the rest of their career. Therefore, evidence of a strong research pipeline that can sustain a record of effectiveness in research must accompany each application for promotion and/or tenure.

Service. Participation in Department, College, and University service activities is expected of all faculty members; such involvement is not adequate justification for awarding tenure. It is crucial to provide evidence of service leadership and its associated impact on learners, colleagues, the discipline, and the community at large. Faculty candidates must demonstrate effectiveness in service through the evaluation of documented evidence along several dimensions, as outlined below. At a minimum, the service portfolio must include the following:

m. A summary statement of all service activities and their impact on learners, faculty, the University, community, and discipline.

n. A record of participation as a Chair of University, College, and/or Departmental Committees.

o. A record of participation on a University, College, and/or Departmental Committee.

p. Service as an advisor to a student organization.

q. Professional service as a journal editor, journal associate editor, journal editorial board member, and/or journal referee.

r. Service as an external grant reviewer and/or external member of master theses and doctoral dissertations (other universities).

s. Service on advisory boards outside the University.

t. Leadership or office holding in a professional organization within one's local, state, regional, or national professional organization.

u. Major (non-paid) consultation and service to civic organizations, social agencies, government, business, or industry that is of benefit to the faculty member's teaching, research, or administrative work at UTEP. This refers to individual leadership and initiative on a project that has a significant and lasting impact on the policies or operations of the agency or, in other ways, strengthens the relationship between the College or University and the community it serves.

v. Presentations/speeches (non-paid) at trade or professional meetings (i.e., meetings targeted at what is primarily a non-academic audience).
w. Recipient of College/University service awards.
x. Recipient of external service awards.

Application Submission Format

Each faculty for tenure and/or promotion must submit an application in pdf with visible bookmarks and/or placeholders as indicated below for the following categories of information:
- Internal recommendations (placeholders)
  o Dean
  o College committee
  o Department chair
  o Department committee
- Summary statement (three pages or less)*
- Application portfolio*
  o Teaching
    ▪ Overall teaching statement
    ▪ Teaching philosophy
    ▪ Evidence as described previously
  o Research
    ▪ Overall research statement
    ▪ Evidence as described previously
  o Service
    ▪ Overall service statement
    ▪ Evidence as described previously
- External reviews (placeholder)

*Must be populated by faculty applicant

The following summarizes the Hunt College timeline for the promotion and tenure process. Dates or deadlines beyond Hunt College are approximate.

- Faculty candidates are notified by the Department Chair no later than January 1 to prepare the dossier.
- Faculty research portfolio due May 31.
- External review letters solicited by the department chair starting on June 1. Note: Hunt College solicits six letters from tenured outside reviewers at the rank being sought or higher from similar and aspirational schools to UTEP.
- External letters are due by September 1.
- The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendation is due to the Department Chair by October 15.
- The Department Chair's recommendation, along with the candidate's complete application portfolio and the department committee's recommendation, is due to the Dean by November 1.

- The College Committee's recommendation is due to the Dean by November 30.
- Dean's recommendation is due to the Provost by January 15.
- Provost's recommendation is due to the President by April 1.
- President's decision is due by June 1.
- The University of Texas Board of Regents' decision is due by August 31st.

Last updated: July 23, 2025