The University of Texas at El Paso
College of Health Sciences

GUIDELINES for TENURE and/or PROMOTION for TENURED and TENURE-TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS

This document adheres to the UT System policies and incorporates the processes in the UTEP Handbook of Operating Procedures (HoOP) located at:
https://www.utep.edu/hoop/index.html

Faculty members should consult the HoOP for more information. This document recognizes the guidance provided by the UTEP Office of the Provost on Tenure and Promotion available at:
https://www.utep.edu/provost/faculty/tenure-and-promotion.html

This document provides college-specific guidance on the timeline and process prior to the Provost-level review.

Definitions of "Promotion" and "Tenure" as Two Separate Processes: "Promotion" is the process by which a faculty member is considered for advancement to the next highest job rank (i.e., Assistant Professor to Associate Professor or Associate Professor to Professor). The process starts with the faculty candidate submitting a *dossier* (i.e., promotion packet), including all required elements described herein, to the department chair. The dossier is intended as an opportunity for the faculty candidate to demonstrate both quantitatively and qualitatively how and why they have earned promotion as judged by their peers and supervisors. The dossier is reviewed by external peer reviewers, the Department Committee, Department Chair ("Chair") or Program Director ("Director"), College Committee, Dean, Provost, and President. However, only faculty members at the rank equal to or above that being sought by the candidate can officially vote on a recommendation for or against promotion. The exception is that Chairs/Directors will perform reviews of their faculty candidates even when the Chairs/Directors do not have rank at or above the level of promotion being sought. For example, if a Chair is an Associate Professor and a faculty member in their department is applying for promotion to Professor, the Chair would still perform the Chair-level review. Each reviewer or committee is given the candidate's portfolio in advance and is asked to submit a written letter containing a recommendation in favor of or against tenure and/or promotion for the candidate; the committee letter must also include the documentation of the committee vote. That letter will become a permanent part of the portfolio that moves to the next successive review step. The ultimate decision-making authority for tenure rests with the UT System Board of Regents. The ultimate decision-making authority for promotion rests with the President. For faculty who are already tenured, the promotion process is considered *discretionary*, meaning that the faculty candidate may choose to put their dossier forward for promotion during any given year after tenure is awarded. In addition, for faculty members who seek tenure and promotion early, ahead of their tenure clock, the process is also considered discretionary.

"Tenure" is the process by which a faculty candidate is considered for a continuing appointment as a member of the faculty at the University. Only tenure-track faculty members are eligible for tenure. At UTEP, the processes of tenure and promotion are linked for tenure-track faculty during their probationary period. An exception is when a faculty member is hired at the rank of associate professor without tenure; in that case, the faculty member may complete the tenure process as a separate step. During the probationary period, tenure-track faculty members are employed by the University through appointments that may be renewed annually. Per the HoOP, an academic year is the period from September 1 to August 31. "If a faculty member is initially appointed during an academic

year, the period of service from the date of the appointment until the following September 1st shall not be counted as academic service toward the calculation of the maximum probationary period" (HoOP, 4.4.1.4). Except for faculty members who have been granted extensions to their tenure clock, the process of tenure and promotion will begin at the end of the 5th year of the probationary period.

The remainder of this document is devoted to providing guidelines for tenured and tenure-track (T/TT) faculty candidates during their tenure and promotion or discretionary promotion processes. Throughout the document, the term "dossier" refers to the candidate's initial submission of materials for internal consideration for tenure and/or promotion. The term "portfolio" refers to the cumulative set of materials, including the dossier itself, the external letters, letters containing votes and recommendations from each level of review, and any other supporting materials.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS

Notification: For faculty ("candidate") seeking tenure and promotion, the College of Health Sciences (CHS) Dean's Office will provide written email notification before January 1 of the 5th year of the probationary period stating that the candidate must submit electronic dossiers to their Chair/Director, copying the Dean's Office, by May 31 (dossier for external reviewers) and August 15 (dossier for internal review) of that same academic year.

Tenured faculty candidates seeking promotion and tenure-track faculty members seeking early review for tenure and promotion must notify the Chair/Director and CHS Dean's Office of the intent to apply for promotion by April 1. Tenure-track faculty members seeking early consideration for tenure and promotion are encouraged to begin discussions with their Chair/Director prior to this April 1 deadline.

No faculty member may vote for the candidate at more than one level of review. For example, the Chair/Director may not vote at the Departmental level of review and also make a recommendation at the Chair/Director level. Similarly, a faculty member may not vote at both the Departmental and College levels of review.

Throughout these guidelines, references are made to the "Chair/Director" as the leader of the academic department/program in which the candidate holds their appointment. As noted above, the Chair/Director will evaluate the candidate in their supervisory role within the Department or Program. In situations where the Chair/Director is the candidate seeking tenure and/or promotion, the candidate will not be reviewed at the Chair level, and the portfolio will proceed to the next level of review. The primary consideration is that all candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion are afforded a process that is as close to the typical review process as possible, while allowing for flexibility when a candidate's leadership role necessitates it.



Figure 1. Levels of review and CHS/UTEP due dates

External Review: The candidate will provide a list of 5-10 scholars for consideration as potential external reviewers by May 1. The Chair/Director, in consultation with the CHS Dean's Office, will identify 3-5 additional scholars as potential external reviewers. The complete list of potential external reviewers will be established by the Dean's Office and Chair/Director; the list will be shared with the candidate, who may eliminate one reviewer if a conflict of interest exists, documenting the reason for the elimination. The Chair/Director will retain a record of the eliminated reviewer, along with the candidate's reason for the elimination.

The Chair, in collaboration with the Dean's Office, will obtain at least three (3) objective letters of evaluation from reputable individuals in the discipline who have never been closely associated with the candidate or the University. Each external reviewer must hold at least the rank for which the candidate is applying and be employed by at least a peer or aspirant peer institution. External reviewers will be apprised that letters must systematically assess the quality of candidates' research, scholarship, and creative work.

Acceptable external reviewers:

- will be familiar with the scholarship and scientific publications of the candidate's field of study
- will not have been closely associated with the candidate or the University
- will be able to critically evaluate the candidate's scholarly and professional activities at the regional, national, and international levels

A written request from the Chair/Director to provide an independent, professional evaluation of the research and scholarship activities of the candidate will be sent to potential external reviewers by May 7. Templates at https://www.utep.edu/provost/faculty/tenure-and-promotion.html provide the required language for these requests (see External Reviewer Request Template and External Review Acceptance Criteria Template). A minimum of 3 and maximum of 6 external reviewer letters will be obtained. The request will inform the external reviewers that under Texas law their evaluation letters may become public if a legal request is made. The deadline for receipt of external reviewer letters is September 1. The external reviewer letters will become part of the candidate's confidential (except as required by law) internal portfolio, which will be maintained within the Dean's Office across each level of review within the College.

The candidate's Chair/Director is responsible for keeping complete records of the correspondence with external reviewers, including copies of each request for external review; copies of each external review; and dates of communication with each external reviewer. If a prospective external reviewer declines to review a candidate, the candidate's Chair/Director will keep a record of the reason for this decision and return to the complete list of potential reviewers to choose a suitable replacement reviewer as necessary.

Departmental Committee Review and Recommendation: Following the policies in the UT System Regents' Rules and the UTEP HoOP (Section 3, Chapter 4), consideration of an individual for tenure and promotion will be initiated by the Department. The Chair/Director will send the complete (internal) dossier and external letters (i.e., the portfolio), directly to the Dean's Office by September 1. The Dean's Office will coordinate transmission of the portfolio to each level of review, beginning with the Departmental Committee, until the portfolio is released from the College for review by the Provost's Office. All department committee members participating in a tenure or promotion decision shall have an opportunity to study the candidate's portfolio in advance. The primary criterion for recommendations of tenure or promotion is the performance of the candidate. Factors to be considered shall include, but are not limited to, an evaluation of (a) teaching effectiveness; (b) quality of publications, including quality of the journals or other publication outlets; (c) quality of research efforts (e.g., competitive proposals, external funding); (d) quality of profession-related service outside the University; (e) external letters of evaluation; (f) the candidate's contributions to the Department, the College, the University, and the discipline; and (g) the candidate's potential for future outstanding scholarship and future positive contributions to the University and to the community at-large.

Only the tenured faculty members in a department are eligible to vote on recommendations for tenure. Only faculty members of a rank higher than the candidate are eligible to vote on recommendations for promotion. If there is not a sufficient number (3 or more) of faculty members eligible to vote, the Dean of the College, in consultation with the Department Chair, shall appoint additional voting members from related disciplines.

Individual committee members must identify any potential personal conflicts of interest and notify the Chair/Director of the need for replacement with a suitable alternate member. The Chair of the committee will be selected by the committee.

The Departmental Committee shall review the candidate's portfolio, which includes the internal dossier and the external letters. The Chair of the Departmental Committee will conduct an anonymous vote on the recommendation of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. A departmental letter will be written collectively by the committee and addressed to the Chair/Director, evaluating the candidate's portfolio. The results of the vote will be recorded within the committee's letter to indicate the number of votes for, votes against, and abstentions, as well as the number of committee members voting. Additionally, the letter should summarize the candidate's teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service with consideration of the letters from external reviewers.

The candidate will be informed of the recommendation of the Departmental Committee. At this point in the evaluation process, the candidate's portfolio will contain the dossier, the letters from external reviewers, the Departmental Committee's letter, and any supporting materials. The Dean's Office will maintain these materials and will forward them to the Chair/Director for the next level of review.

Department Chair/Program Director Review and Recommendation: Upon receipt of the candidate's portfolio, the Chair/Director will complete an independent review of the materials. The Chair/Director will then write an independent letter, including their recommendation and providing evidence to support their recommendation. The letter should also include a discussion about the external reviewers and why they were chosen. The letter will be included in the candidate's portfolio.

The candidate will be informed of the recommendation of the Department Chair/Program Director. At this point in the evaluation process, the candidate's portfolio will contain the dossier, the letters from external reviewers, the Departmental Committee's letter, the Chair's or Program Director's letter, and any supporting materials. The Dean's Office will maintain these materials and forward them to the College Committee for the next level of review.

College Committee Review and Recommendation: The Dean's Office shall appoint an appropriate College Committee and instruct the committee on its purpose and function. If the College does not have a sufficient number of faculty members at the appropriate rank (3 or more), the Dean's Office will invite faculty members from other Colleges in related disciplines to serve on the College Committee. Only the tenured faculty members are eligible to vote on recommendations for tenure. Only faculty members at or above the rank being sought are eligible to vote on recommendations for promotion. Individual committee members must identify any potential personal conflicts of interest and notify the Dean's Office of the need for replacement with a suitable alternate member. The Chair of the committee will be selected by the committee.

The College Committee will review the candidate's portfolio. The Chair of the Committee will conduct an anonymous vote on the recommendation of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. The College Committee shall collectively write a letter to the Dean for each candidate, evaluating the candidate's teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service with consideration of the materials in the portfolio. The results of the vote will be recorded within the committee's letter to indicate the number of votes for, votes against, and abstentions, and the number of committee members voting. Dissenting members of the committee may submit their own signed letters to the Dean, which will be added to the candidate's portfolio.

The candidate will be informed of the recommendation of the College Committee. At this point in the evaluation process, the candidate's portfolio will contain the dossier; the letters from external reviewers; the letters of the Departmental Committee, the Chair/Director, and the College Committee; any dissenting letters of the College

Committee; and any supporting materials.

Dean's Review and Recommendation: The Dean will complete an independent review of all materials in the candidate's portfolio and compose an independent letter with recommendation, including evidence to support the recommendation. The candidate will be informed of the Dean's recommendation. No later than January 15, the Dean's Office will forward the candidate's complete portfolio to the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. At this point in the evaluation process, the candidate's portfolio will contain the dossier; letters from external reviewers; the letters of the Departmental Committee, the Chair/Director, the College Committee (including any dissenting letters), and the Dean; and any supporting materials.

TENURE and/or PROMOTION (T&P) DEADLINES

Deadline	***Item***	***Responsible Party***
Jan 1 (5^{th} year for tenure and promotion)	CHS Dean's Office sends letter advising pre-tenure faculty member ("candidate") and Chair/Director about upcoming T&P evaluation	Dean's Office
Apr 1	Faculty member seeking discretionary promotion notifies Chair/Director and Dean's Office	Candidate
May 1	Candidate submits list of 5-10 suggested external reviewers to Chair/Director and Dean's Office	Candidate
May 7	Chair/Director sends external reviewer request letters out using template	Chair/Director
May 31	Candidate sends external dossier for external reviewers to Chair/Director	Candidate
June 1	Chair/Director sends external dossier to external reviewers	Chair/Director
Aug 15	Candidate sends internal dossier for internal review as an indexed PDF to Chair/Director, copying Dean's Office	Candidate
Sept 1	External review letters due to Chair/Director; Chair/Director forwards internal dossier and external review letters to Dean's Office, who sends portfolio to Departmental Committee	External Reviewers and Chair/Director
Sept 23	Departmental Committee letter is due to the Dean's Office, who informs candidate of committee recommendation and forwards portfolio to Chair/Director	Departmental Committee, Dean's Office

Oct 15	Chair/Director letter is due to the Dean's Office, who informs candidate of Chair/Director recommendation and forwards portfolio to College Committee	Chair/Director, Dean's Office
Nov 15	College Committee letter is due to the Dean's Office, who informs candidate of committee recommendation; Dean begins evaluation of candidate's portfolio	College Committee, Dean's Office
Jan 15	Dean's letter along with complete portfolio is due to the Provost's Office	Dean, Provost's Office
Feb 15	Last point at which new publications, grant submissions, grant awards, books, book chapters, etc., can be added to the portfolio via formal candidate letter or memo sent to the Dean's Office	Candidate
Apr 1	Provost's recommendation to the President	Provost
Jun 1	President's decision or recommendation to the Regents	President
Aug 31	Regents' decision	Regents

The TENURE and/or PROMOTION DOSSIER

The candidate must first review the Tenure and/or Promotion Guidelines document to understand the criteria required for achieving tenure and/or promotion. Tenure and/or promotion policies are defined in The Handbook of Operating Procedures (HoOP, Section 3, Chapter 4) available at:

https://www.utep.edu/hoop/section-3/academic-policies-and-faculty-personnel-matter/index.html

It is important that each candidate applying for tenure and/or promotion prepare and present for evaluation a complete, well-organized, well-documented, and clear dossier to accurately reflect the record of the candidate.

As discussed below, both an external dossier (for external reviewers) and an internal dossier are prepared by the candidate. These dossiers are to be **submitted electronically**. All materials for each are to be in an indexed PDF file. Original documents not in electronic form are to be scanned in with sufficient quality to be clearly viewed by the reviewers.

Dossiers should be arranged and sectioned according to a Table of Contents matching the outlines below. Each section should be clearly marked and delineated. Where possible, imbedded links to associated sections/materials (bookmarks) should be included to facilitate easy navigation of the overall packet for both external and internal reviewers. While the external and internal tenure and/or promotion dossiers should be organized and ordered as indicated below, these outlines should not be interpreted to exclude the incorporation of additional, important material.

EXTERNAL REVIEWER DOSSIER

A separate PDF file ("external dossier") will be created by the candidate that includes information for the external reviewers. This external dossier will be submitted to the Department Chair/Program Director by May 31. The external review dossier will contain:

1. Executive summary of career trajectory, including research philosophy and goals (1 page)
2. Summary of major accomplishments in research and scholarship, including research priorities, relationship of current work to past work, and future research plans (3-5 pages)
3. PDFs of 4-5 peer-reviewed publications
4. Updated *Curriculum Vita.*

INTERNAL TENURE and/or PROMOTION DOSSIER

Note: The internal tenure and/or promotion dossier described below will be submitted by the candidate to the Chair/Director by August 15, who will forward it to the Dean's Office by September 1. At any point between August 15 and February 15, new publications, grant submissions, grant awards, books, book chapters, etc., can be added to the portfolio.

To "add" additional materials to the dossier for consideration once the first level of internal review (i.e., the Departmental Committee review) is complete, the candidate should develop a formal memo/letter, addressed to the current level of review (e.g., College of Health Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee, Dean, etc.), and list/describe additional major accomplishments (see above). This formal memo/letter will be included within the portfolio following the materials of the previous level of review, creating a chronological record of the materials that have been added to the portfolio following the initial submission of the dossier.

1. GENERAL DOCUMENTS

1.1. Updated *Curriculum Vita*

1.2. Executive Summary (Maximum of 3 pages)
A summary, no more than three pages in length, of the faculty member's teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The section on teaching should include a summary of student evaluations and peer observations of teaching. The candidate can expand upon the themes in this summary within the latter narrative sections of the dossier (Sections 2, 3, and 4).

1.3. Faculty member's Annual Performance Evaluations since initial appointment or since most recent promotion

2. TEACHING ACTIVITIES

2.1. Teaching Narrative
This section may contain a statement specific to the candidate's teaching philosophy. The section is an introduction to the teaching section of the dossier and, as such, should place teaching activities (as detailed in the subsections below) in context. (3 page maximum).

2.2. Professional Information

2.2.1. List of courses taught

2.2.2. List of new courses and/or major course revisions including conversions to online

teaching or hybrid format and addition of service learning components

2.2.3. Teaching load information, including level and class size

2.2.4. Evidence of curriculum development, including sample syllabi and course materials

2.2.5. Demonstrated creativity in teaching; e.g. teaching awards, established new clinical site, developed new teaching-learning activity, produced media such as videos, software, etc.

2.2.6. Professional development in teaching, including workshops and seminars presented and attended

2.2.7. Participation and accomplishment in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL)

2.2.8. Advising of undergraduate and graduate students

2.2.9. Other evidence (optional)

2.3. Evidence of Teaching Quality

2.3.1. Student evaluations and comments, tabulated and summarized (include actual student evaluations as an appendix)

2.3.2. Projects, Theses and Dissertations supervised

2.3.3. Honors and awards earned by supervised students

2.3.4. Career achievements of mentored students

2.3.5. Community and/or school-based projects guided and produced in connection with courses (service-learning experiences)

2.3.6. Copies of peer evaluations from UTEP faculty members who have observed classes or reviewed course materials

2.3.7. Honors or awards for teaching excellence

2.3.8. Extramural funds awarded for instructional, innovation, facilities, and student support

2.3.9. Other evidence (optional)

3. RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

3.1. Research/Scholarship Narrative

This section may contain a statement specific to the candidate's line(s) of research and the impact of the research. The section is an introduction to the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities section of the dossier and, as such, should place the candidate's research activity and impact (as detailed in the subsections below) in context. (3 page maximum).

3.2. Evidence of Success in Research and Other Scholarly Activities

3.2.1. List of articles in refereed scholarly journals (include a maximum of three most significant papers as an appendix)

- 3.2.1.1 Submitted (under review)
- 3.2.1.2 In-press
- 3.2.1.3 Published

3.2.2. List of abstracts in refereed scholarly journals or conference proceedings

- 3.1.2.1. Submitted (under review)
- 3.1.2.2. In-press
- 3.1.2.3. Published

3.2.3. List of abstracts or papers presented at scholarly meetings that are not published in refereed scholarly journals

- 3.1.3.1. Submitted (under review)

3.1.3.2. Presented

3.2.4. List of published books, book chapters, monographs, etc. (include ISBN, ISSN)
3.2.5. List of non-referred articles written for the public or professional audience
3.2.6. Citation data of articles in refereed scholarly journals
3.2.7. Impact factors of refereed journals where published
3.2.8. Other evidence (optional)

3.3. Evidence of Success in Securing Intramural Funding

3.3.1. Proposals funded
3.3.2. Proposals pending
3.3.3. Proposals submitted (not awarded)
3.3.4. Other evidence (optional)

3.4. Evidence of Success in Securing Extramural Funding

3.4.1. Proposals funded
3.4.2. Proposals pending
3.4.3. Proposals submitted (not awarded)
3.4.4. Other evidence (optional)

3.5. Evidence of Involving Students in Research

3.5.1. Number of students supported by extramural/intramural funding
3.5.2. Articles co-authored with students
3.5.3. Presentations by students involved in research at national and international conferences
3.5.4. Other evidence (optional)

4. SERVICE ACTIVITIES

4.1. Service Narrative

This section should contain a statement specific to the candidate's service. The statement may include a philosophy and/or the ways in which service at each level is integrated with the candidate's research and teaching. The section is an introduction to the Service Activities section of the dossier and, as such, should place the candidate's service activities (as detailed in the subsections below) in context, highlighting the impact of the activities. (3 page maximum).

4.2. Evidence of Service to the University

4.2.1. Service on departmental, college, or university committees at UTEP
4.2.2. Supervision of student organizations at UTEP
4.2.3. Service in an administrative role at UTEP
4.2.4. Other evidence (optional)

4.3. Evidence of Service to Community, Regional, National, or International Organizations

(Include the following sections as applicable.)

4.3.1. Service on professional and community boards
4.3.2. Membership and leadership in professional and technical societies
4.3.3. Service to the profession, including editorships, editorial boards, participation in panel reviews, and regular and ad-hoc reviewer for journals

4.3.4. Consulting work or clinical practice
4.3.5. Program review for state/national accreditation bodies
4.3.6. Conference organization and/or hosting
4.3.7. Activities involving community partners, service learning, or collaborative projects
4.3.8. Lectures to community and professional audiences and organizations
4.3.9. Other evidence (optional)

BOYER MODEL OF SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship of:	Purpose	Measures of Performance
Teaching	Study teaching models and practices to achieve optimal student learning	• Advancing learning theory through classroom research • Developing and validating instructional materials • Mentoring graduate students • Designing and implementing course-, program-, and/or college-level assessment system
Discovery	Create/discover new knowledge through traditional research	• Publishing in refereed forums • Producing creative work within established field • Creating infrastructure for future studies (establishing a distinct line of study, grant funding, etc.)
Integration	Interpret and incorporate the use of evidence-based knowledge across disciplines	• Preparing/publishing a comprehensive literature review • Authoring a textbook for use in multiple disciplines • Collaborative course design and/or deliver (within and/or across disciplines)
Application	Contribute/expand society's and/or profession's ability to address problems	• Consulting services to industry or government • Assuming leadership positions for professional organizations • Fostering the professional growth of students through mentoring/advising
Adapted from: Marta Nibert. 2.5.1 Boyer's Model of Scholarship. In Faculty Guidebook: A Comprehensive Tool for Improving Faculty Performance. Eds: Beyerlein, Holmes, Apple. Plainfield, IL, Pacific Crest; 2007.		