College of Liberal Arts
Guidelines for College Tenure and Promotion Committee

UTEP is a national model for creating and successfully executing highly competitive academic and research programs while maintaining a deep commitment to serving a 21st century student demographic. The College of Liberal Arts is an integral part of UTEP’s goal to become a Research 1 or Tier 1 university. Because success depends on all faculty members striving for excellence in their creative/research, teaching and service duties, the College is committed to attracting, developing, and promoting exceptional faculty who will help us achieve our collective goals.

The College of Liberal Arts’ Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee is an important component in this process because it helps define the standards for success and, more importantly, it provides guidelines for faculty, departments, and chairs that can be used to help guide individual faculty as they strive for tenure and promotion.¹ This document provides guidelines to faculty in the College about the College T&P Committee duties, responsibilities, and procedures.

Committee Makeup and Guidelines
The College of Liberal Arts T&P Committee is tasked with evaluating candidates for tenure and promotion and with evaluating the process at the departmental level. Committee members are selected by the Dean and normally serve between 3 and 5 years. Members are selected to reflect the broad creative and research interests of the College. Thus, every effort is made to ensure that the Committee is comprised of faculty from the fine arts, humanities, and social sciences. All Committee members must be tenured and at the rank of associate professor or professor and be well-respected scholars in their respective field. Committee members must recuse themselves from all discussion and votes that involve (1) the promotion of faculty to a rank that is higher than the member’s current rank (e.g., a committee member is an associate professor and the individual under consideration is applying for professor); (2) the promotion and/or tenure of a faculty from their home department; (3) the promotion and/or tenure of a faculty with whom there is some conflict of interest as defined by the Handbook of Operating Procedures. Finally, all discussion within the committee is considered confidential.

Preparation
Prior to meeting, the College T&P Committee should carefully review this document and all sections of the Handbook of Operating Procedures (HoOP) relating to Tenure and Promotion, including:

¹ For simplicity, department is used to refer to both departments and programs and chair is used to refer to both department chairs and program directors.
4.4.5.3.4 Professor
4.4.5.4 Initiation of Promotion or Tenure Review Procedures
4.4.5.5 Departmental Procedures
4.4.5.6 College Procedures
4.4.5.8 Provision of Information to Candidates and Opportunity for Submitting Additional Information
4.4.6 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion at the University of Texas at El Paso
4.4.7 Promotion

Review Procedures for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The principal function of the College T&P Committee is to make an independent evaluation of the candidates’ qualifications for advancement. The second function is to evaluate whether the tenure and promotion procedures for each candidate was thorough at the department level and complied with and addressed the University and College criteria. Each member of the committee should first review the candidate’s vita and 2-page narrative statements for creative/research activities, teaching, and service (see HoOP 4.4.5.5.2 – F).

Committee members should then review the portfolios submitted by each candidate to assess the external reviewers’ evaluations, department recommendations, and chair recommendations.

- **Assessment of external review** – Although only three external reviews are required according to the HoOP, the College seeks at least four external reviews. Each external reviewer should have clear expertise in the research/creative area of the candidate and be a nationally recognized expert in that area. This expertise should be readily inferred from the curriculum vita (CV) of the reviewer.
  - Appropriateness of external reviewers
    - Does each reviewer hold the appropriate rank (see HoOP 4.4.5.5.2 – G)?
    - Does each reviewer come from a peer or aspirant university (see HoOP 4.4.5.5.2 – G)?
    - In instances when a reviewer or reviewers are from non-peer/aspirant institutions, the chair should discuss why the reviewer or reviewers were selected and provide convincing arguments as to the appropriateness of the reviewer (e.g., creative/research activity clearly exceeds local or national standards of desired rank).
    - Does the reviewer clearly articulate that there is no close association with the candidate and/or UTEP (see HoOP 4.4.5.5.2 – G)?

2. Because the external review process is the foundation for the review of candidates’ scholarship, it is important that the College T&P Committee assess the quality of this foundation. In instances in which there is a high quality external review, this provides a strong basis for the remainder of the review process. In instances in which aspects of the external review is wanting, more work at subsequent subsequent levels of the review process may be necessary to ensure that a thorough review of the candidate’s scholarship is done.
• Is the expertise of the reviewer readily apparent from the CV and the chair’s discussion of the reviewer? The chair’s letter should clearly discuss why each reviewer is a nationally recognized expert in that candidate’s area. This discussion should be based on the reviewer's CV and may involve demonstrated excellence of the reviewer’s scholarship, department, and/or institution (e.g., see Carnegie classification for institutions).

○ Quality of external reviews
  ▪ Does each reviewer assess the quality of the outlets/venues?
  ▪ Is it apparent that the reviewer read/viewed/heard the research/creative work?
  ▪ Does the reviewer evaluate the impact, importance, or significance of the publications and creative activities?
  ▪ Does the reviewer address all the points/questions requested in the department’s solicitation for review?

○ Trajectory of the candidate
  ▪ Does each reviewer comment on the trajectory of the candidate?

• Assessment of departmental review – The College T&P Committee should evaluate whether the departmental review provides supporting evidence for assertions about the quality of creative/research work, teaching, and service.

○ Research/Creative Work
  ▪ Does the departmental review contain an independent assessment of the candidate’s research and/or creative activity?
    • The departmental review may highlight aspects from the external review but should also contain an independent assessment of quality and impact. This review of quality is especially important in instances in which it is apparent that one or more reviewers did not carefully review the candidate’s creative/research materials.
    • The departmental discussion about both quantity and quality should be based on department guidelines for tenure and promotion.
  ▪ Is there discussion regarding how the candidate’s research/creative activity fits with the mission of the department, College, and/or University?
    • The discussion should clearly articulate relevant institutional goals and how candidate’s creative/research activity helps contribute to this.
  ▪ Does the department discuss the candidate’s creative/research trajectory?

○ Teaching
  ▪ Does the department provide evidence that the candidate has successfully taught all relevant lower-level, upper-level, and graduate courses?
    • When teaching at all three levels is not relevant (e.g., department does not have graduate courses), this should be clearly articulated.
    • The discussion of graduate instruction should discuss evidence for successful graduate mentoring of master’s and doctoral students, if applicable.
- Is there discussion of the candidate’s willingness and flexibility in teaching core and/or required courses in discipline?
  - How valuable to the discipline and/or major are new courses that the candidate developed?
- Are student evaluations reviewed and discussed in relation to department standards?
- Are peer evaluations reviewed and discussed in relation to department standards?
- Does the review discuss evidence that the candidate is working to continually improve and refine courses and/or teaching (e.g., periodically updating courses, attending workshops)?

  ○ Service
  - Does the department clearly articulate the service expectations for faculty to achieve tenure and promotion or promotion?
    - Because service can take many forms (national, university, college, department, community), it is very important that the departmental letter discuss expectations for service.
  - Is there a discussion that helps to illustrate the quality and impact of the candidate’s service (see HoOP 4.4.6.1.7)?
  - Does the department discuss the trajectory for future service?
    - If the department indicates that tenure-track faculty have reduced service expectations, does the candidate’s research/teaching/service portfolio suggest the ability to take-on additional service duties in the future?

- **Assessment of the chair’s review** – The format of the chair’s review should generally mirror that of the departmental review. The chair’s review should discuss creative/research activities, teaching, and service but can do so in the context of the preceding external and departmental reviews. If the external and departmental reviews provide a thorough review of creative/research activities that was adequately supported by evidence, for example, it is sufficient for the chair to briefly comment on this without doing an independent assessment. It is more important that the chair’s review address issues that are not covered as thoroughly in the external or departmental reviews and/or address any disagreement in the preceding reviews. As was done for the departmental review, the College T&P Committee should evaluate whether the chair’s review provides supporting evidence for assertions about quality of research/creative work, teaching, and service. The chair’s review should also:
  - Clearly review the department’s tenure and promotion process.
  - Discuss the process for selection of external reviewers.
    - What were the criteria for identifying external reviewers?
    - How many reviewers declined to review and what were the reasons they gave for declining?
    - Does the final set of reviewers match the criteria and represent an appropriate set of reviewers?
Does the chair clearly state that all external reviews received are included in the candidate’s portfolio? If any external reviews were omitted, is there a reasonable explanation for why they were omitted?

Review Procedures for Promotion to Professor

The processes for promotion to professor should generally mirror those for tenure and promotion with three exceptions. First, external reviewers for promotion to professor should be professors and accomplished scholars. Second, individuals on the College T&P Committee who review candidates for professor must be professors. If there are not at least three professors on the College T&P Committee, ad hoc members will be appointed by the Dean to assist in the review of individuals being evaluated for professor. Third, the criteria for promotion to professor differ from those for tenure and promotion to associate professor (see HoOP 4.4.5.3.4). These criteria indicate that the candidate should have (1) demonstrated excellence in teaching and service, (2) actively and regularly contributed to graduate education (or provide other evidence of capability of teaching at the graduate level if department does not have graduate program), and (3) be judged a mature scholar in her or his discipline. The criteria for being judged a mature scholar are defined as “continued publication of significant scholarly works in prestigious academic journals, or by continued appropriate artistic expression; by national and international fellowships and awards won; and by national and international positions held in professional organizations”. Given the diverse nature of the college, “significant scholarly works” are not limited to academic journals and may include books, book chapters, extramural funding and other types of scholarship relevant to the discipline.

Feb. 6, 2018 – Draft proposal submitted to chairs/directors (Dean’s Digest, Vol. 1 #3)
Feb. 20, 2018 – Dean and associate deans reviewed feedback from chairs/directors
Mar. 13, 2018 – Revised proposal implemented and posted on website
Appendix 1.
Handbook of Operating Procedures regarding tenure and promotion.

4.4.5.5.3 All department members participating in a tenure or promotion decision shall have an opportunity to study the candidate's file in advance. The primary criterion for recommendations of tenure or promotion is the performance of the individual. 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 shows, performances, national or international awards, etc. for those in the visual and performing arts;
   e. Quality of profession-related service outside the University;
   f. External letters of evaluation;
   g. The candidate's contributions to the Department, the College or School, the University, and the discipline;
   h. The candidate's potential for future outstanding intellectual development and future positive contributions to the University.

It further states the following.

4.4.6 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion at The University of Texas at El Paso
Updated July 27, 2015

Because of the subjective nature of judgments and the diversity of academic disciplines, the criteria for tenure and promotion cannot be specified in such detail that they can be applied automatically. Nevertheless, the following guidelines and principles should be adhered to whenever possible:

   a. All University faculty must satisfactorily perform the minimum duties specified in 4.3 above, however, satisfactory performance alone is not sufficient for the awarding of tenure or promotion.
   b. Similar criteria for recommendations for promotion and tenure should be used in all units of the University. Academic units are permitted to use such procedures as they devise, provided they do not conflict with the provisions of this Handbook and have been approved by the Dean of the College or School and the Provost. Those procedures shall be communicated to faculty.
   c. As the University’s academic reputation grows, the standard of performance for awarding tenure and promotion will increase concomitantly. If a faculty member's accomplishments do not keep pace with the current standards of performance for tenure and promotion, that individual may not be awarded tenure or advanced in rank. It is not appropriate to argue that a candidate be awarded tenure or promotion because he or she meets the performance standards that were in effect when others in that department received tenure or promotion.
d. Years in service is a factor but is not to be used as a primary justification for tenure or promotion recommendations.

4.4.6.1 Tenure

The single most important decision made by the University with respect to individual faculty members is the granting of tenure. Tenure is awarded by the University 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 College and University programs depends upon the qualifications of the tenured faculty. Therefore, tenure decisions will include consideration of factors related to planned programmatic changes.

4.4.6.1.1 The recommendation to award tenure will generally be made during the sixth year of full-time academic service, unless an individual's performance is truly outstanding.

4.4.6.1.2 Normally, only those faculty members with the terminal degree appropriate for the discipline may be awarded tenure.

4.4.6.1.3 Only faculty members who have demonstrated their competence in teaching may be awarded tenure. This competence may be demonstrated in diverse ways, e.g., development of superior course materials or textbooks and excellence in the supervision of research, practica, or internship work; in individual instruction in the fine arts; or in the scholarship of teaching and learning. Student and/or peer evaluation of teaching performance is an essential part of the demonstration of teaching competence.

4.4.6.1.4 A faculty member will not normally be granted tenure without clear evidence of competence and willingness to teach at all available levels of instruction, i.e., lower division, upper division, and graduate. Justification must be provided for a tenure recommendation for any faculty member who cannot teach at all three levels.

4.4.6.1.5 Minimum performance standards require a faculty member to remain current in the discipline; therefore, this factor alone is not a sufficient basis for the recommendation of tenure.

4.4.6.1.6 A faculty member will not be granted tenure without a clear history of significant contributions to the advancement of knowledge in his or her discipline. The faculty member must also be judged to be likely to continue making such contributions for the rest of the career. Therefore, the following criteria are offered as guidelines in evaluating scholarly activity of a faculty member:

a. 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 recommendation for tenure and promotion or to balance quantity of contributions against quality.
b. The importance of the work to the discipline should be judged not only by the departmental faculty, but also by the outside evaluators. For example, no fewer than three (3) letters of evaluation are used to assess the merit of the candidate’s research and scholarship.

c. 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 nationally-known scholars or practitioners. Usually, this means that works must appear in recognized outlets appropriate for the discipline (e.g., publications, competitive external funding, national performances or exhibits.). Experiments completed but not published, books or articles in draft form, classified documents, and undisplayed works of art, for example, are considered to be private works and not yet in the public domain. They may, of course, be considered along with an individual's other accomplishments, but they may not be used to satisfy this criterion.

d. 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.

4.4.6.1.7 Since participation in Department, College or School, and University activities is expected of all faculty members, such involvement is not adequate justification for awarding tenure.

4.4.7 Promotion