

GENERAL GUIDELINES
FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE OF ALL FACULTY RANKS
EXCLUDING THE MEDICAL SCHOOL
2018-19 ACADEMIC YEAR

<u>CONTENTS</u>		<u>Page</u>
<u>Section A</u>	<u>Overview</u>	2
A.1	Introduction	
A.2	Areas of Contribution Applicable to all Faculty	
A.3	Recommendations for Tenure	
A.4	Associate Professors (with Tenure)	
A.5	Instructors in a Probationary Status	
A.6	Non-tenure Track Ranks	
<u>Section B</u>	<u>Roles and Responsibilities</u>	5
B.1	Procedural Responsibilities of Department Chair or Dean	
B.2	Candidate's Rights and Responsibilities	
B.3	Assessments and Recommendations	
<u>Section C</u>	<u>Dossier Assembly</u>	9
C.1	Recommendations	
C.2	Curriculum Vitae, and Other Information	
C.3	Teaching	
C.4	Research/Scholarship/Creativity	
C.5	Academic Advising, Counseling, and Other Student Services	
C.6	Service to the University and to the Nation, State and Community	
C.7	Honors and Other Evidence of Merit or Recognition, Including Contracts and Grants	
C.8	Letters of Reference/Recommendation/Evaluation	
C.9	Additional Statements	
C.10	Supplemental Materials	
<u>Section D</u>	<u>Outcomes</u>	16
D.1	Announcement of Decisions	
D.2	Final Arguments for Terminal Appointment Pending Cases	
D.3	Request for Review by Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR)	
D.4	Reconsideration of a Promotion and Tenure Decision in the Terminal Year	
D.5	Grievances	
D.6	Resources	
Appendix A:	Summary of Dossier Preparation and UT Box PDF File Names and Contents	19

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

Section A Overview

A.1 INTRODUCTION

The goal of the promotion process is to provide a thorough and objective review of the substance and merits of each faculty member's case following customary methods. The review must be sufficient in its depth and character to support action in the best interests of the university, whatever the decision reached. To accomplish this, the evaluation process comprises an independent review at multiple levels: budget council/executive committee, department chair, college/school, dean, and central administration. The recommendations at each level reflect the professional judgment of each of those involved, with the president making the final decision.

The following General Guidelines describe the promotion process for tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure-track candidates, and are provided to assist both candidates and academic units with preparation of supporting materials and management of candidate files for promotion. The dean may distribute additional written procedural guidelines and information for preparation of candidate dossiers in his or her college/school and will deliver one copy of any additional guidelines or information distributed to the candidates to the Provost's Office along with the dossiers from his or her college/school. It is recognized that variation in requirements is possible among disciplines and departments. Such variations are considered both appropriate and healthy. Candidates should check with their department chairs or, in non-departmentalized colleges/schools, with their dean regarding the requirements and practices in their area.

A.2 AREAS OF CONTRIBUTION APPLICABLE TO ALL FACULTY:

As described in the [Handbook of Operating Procedures \(HOP\) 2-2160](#), recommendations for tenure and recommendations for promotion in rank of all faculty are to be based on excellence in performance pursuant to an evaluation of the faculty member's contribution in the following areas:

- Teaching at both undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Research, creative activities, and other scholarly effort.
- Academic advising, counseling, and other student services.
- Administrative and committee service to the department, college, and university and professional public service to the nation, state, and society.
- Other evidence of merit or recognition, such as fellowships, grants, and special honors.

A.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TENURE:

- a. The granting of tenure has consequences of great magnitude and long life and must be considered especially carefully. Tenure should be awarded only when there is a clear case that the best interest of the university is served by doing so. In the review process, the candidate's record should be examined for:
 - Evidence that contributions of appropriate magnitude and distinction in teaching, research, and service have been made, AND
 - Evidence that such contributions can be sustained through an extended career with the university.

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

b. Assistant to Associate Professor:

A recommendation for promotion to associate professor normally is considered in the sixth year of the individual's service as assistant professor (or combined service as instructor and assistant professor). Cases considered before the sixth year in rank are accelerated and must be explained in the department chair's and dean's statements.

An assistant professor must be reviewed no later than the sixth year of the probationary period and be either promoted to associate professor with tenure or placed on terminal appointment for the next year. A year in which a faculty member has been on leave without pay or claimed an extension in accordance with [HOP 2-2020](#) does not count toward the probationary period.

Candidates whose probationary period has been extended under [HOP 2-2020](#) or due to leave without pay in accordance with university family and medical leave policies shall be evaluated as if the work were done in the normal period of service.

c. Associate Professor or Professor Without Tenure:

The tenure status of individuals appointed to the associate professor or professor ranks without tenure must be reviewed no later than the third year of probationary service. Associate professors without tenure may be considered either for tenure in the rank of associate professor or for tenure and promotion to full professor simultaneously.

A.4 ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS (with tenure):

Associate professors with tenure may be considered for promotion to professor during any year deemed appropriate by the budget council/executive committee and department chair. Promotion before six years in rank have elapsed is considered accelerated and must be explained.

Right of Consideration. As provided in [HOP 2-2160](#): a faculty member in the rank of associate professor has the right to be considered for promotion to professor in his or her tenth year of service as an associate professor. To invoke this right of consideration, the associate professor must advise his or her department chair no later than February 1 of his or her ninth year of service of the desire to be considered for promotion to professor. The case shall be considered at all administrative levels, including the president. Should the associate professor not be promoted, he or she may be considered during any year thereafter at the discretion of the budget council/executive committee and department chair or may invoke his or her right to be considered during the end of the subsequent five years of service.

A.5 INSTRUCTORS IN A PROBATIONARY STATUS:

Instructors in their second or third year in rank who become eligible for promotion to assistant professor as a result of obtaining their Ph.D. must be forwarded for review at all levels. The dossiers should demonstrate satisfactory progress while in the rank of instructor. All instructors in their third year of probationary service require formal review regardless of whether they have received the Ph.D.

Instructors who complete the Ph.D. during the first year of academic service do not require review. Formal documentation that the degree has been awarded should be submitted to the Provost's Office and the title will be changed to assistant professor effective September 1 of the second year.

A.6 NON-TENURE TRACK RANKS:

Non-tenure track faculty members assist the institution in meeting a variety of critical needs related to the university's overall mission. Performance expectations for these faculty, however, are not as encompassing in scope as those for tenure-track faculty. Although all contributions and accomplishments of non-tenure track candidates should be evaluated where applicable, special emphasis is to be given to teaching performance and at least one other area of contribution for faculty in lecturer, clinical, and adjunct titles, and to research activity and other academic

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

contributions for faculty in research professor titles.

a. Lecturer Titles

Recommendations for promotion of lecturer or senior lecturer may be considered in the sixth year (or later) of an individual's service in his or her current rank at the university. Cumulative service in rank may be either full time or part time. Recommendations for accelerated promotion must be explained and justified.

The principal role of faculty in the lecturer titles is providing instructional service that augments and complements that of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Thus, exceptional teaching performance is expected and a well-documented record of teaching excellence is required for all such candidates for promotion. The budget council statement/executive committee for each department or academic unit should describe the local rating criteria and service norms for teaching and demonstrate that the candidate's level of teaching service is above the departmental average. In addition, an adequately documented record of significant accomplishment in at least one of the other areas of contribution consistent with the terms of employment is required for promotion to senior lecturer.

The title of distinguished senior lecturer is reserved for individuals who, in addition to teaching excellence, have a sustained record of significant accomplishment adequately documented in at least one of the other areas of contribution consistent with the terms of employment.

b. Clinical and Adjunct Titles

Recommendations for promotion of adjunct assistant professor, adjunct associate professor, clinical instructor, clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, instructor of clinical nursing, assistant professor of clinical nursing, and associate professor of clinical nursing, may be considered in the sixth year (or later) of an individual's service in his or her current rank at the university. Cumulative service in rank may be either full time or part time. Recommendations for accelerated promotion must be explained and justified.

The principal role of faculty in the clinical and adjunct titles is providing instructional service that augments and complements that of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Thus, exceptional teaching performance is expected and a well-documented record of teaching excellence is required for all such candidates for promotion. The budget council statement should describe the local rating criteria and service norms for teaching and demonstrate that the candidate's level of teaching service is above the departmental average. In addition, a record of accomplishment in at least one of the other areas of contribution consistent with the terms of employment is required and must be documented in appropriate ways.

c. Research Professor Titles

Recommendations for promotion of research assistant and research associate professors may be considered in the sixth year (or later) of an individual's service in his or her current rank at the university. Cumulative service in rank may be either full time or part time. Recommendations for accelerated promotion must be explained and justified.

The contribution of faculty appointed as research assistant and research associate professors is principally in the area of research. A well-documented record of research excellence is required. In addition, a record of active contribution to the academic enterprise in other ways is required and must be adequately documented.

d. Instruction and Practice Titles

Effective September 1, 2018, UT Austin will begin using two new faculty title series; 1.) assistant, associate, and full professor of instruction and 2.) assistant, associate, and full professor of practice. For the 2018-19 promotion review cycle, faculty members laterally moved into one of these new series effective September 1, 2018, will be evaluated for promotion using the criteria of their previous title.

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

Section B Roles and Responsibilities

B.1 PROCEDURAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR OR DEAN

Department chairs, or deans in a non-departmentalized college, are responsible for preparing the candidate's file for review and should familiarize themselves with these Guidelines and any other written guidelines provided by the department and/or college. In the spring semester before a faculty member is to be considered for promotion, the department chair, dean, or their designee shall meet with the candidates to explain the process and advise them to become familiar with the applicable guidelines, discuss relative responsibilities for compiling dossier information, and discuss candidate access to materials as detailed in section B.2.

- a. Selecting Referees. The department is responsible for developing a list of peer reviewers with input from the candidate (see Section C.8.d). The reviewers should be from peer institutions/programs and must be at arm's length from the candidate (e.g., not former dissertation chairs/advisors, postdoctoral mentors, coauthors, and/or collaborators). Prior to sending out the solicitation letter to the referees, the chair or dean shall ask the candidate to review the list of individuals to be contacted. After considering concerns that may be expressed by the candidate, the department has final say over reviewer selection. The candidate may place a statement in the file to document any concerns he or she may have about reviewer selection (see Additional Statements, section C.9). The dean (or designee) must approve the final list of letter writers before the solicitation letter is sent.
- b. Review of Materials. Before the departmental committee considers a case, the chair or dean shall ask the candidate to check the materials in the promotion dossier. The purpose of this review is to ensure that all candidate materials are enclosed in the dossier as submitted by the candidate. If the candidate believes that the file is incomplete or includes inappropriate material, or if the candidate has any other objection to the process, the chair, dean, or their designee shall either correct the problem or include a statement in the file about the problem and why it was not addressed as the candidate requested. The candidate may also place a statement in the file about the problem or other aspects of the case.
- c. Additions to the Dossier. All factual information relied upon in the promotion and tenure decision process shall be included in written form in the promotion dossier. All information in the curriculum vitae is considered to be included in the dossier by reference. When such information is added to the promotion dossier after the department chair has asked the candidate to check the materials in the promotion dossier, it shall be date stamped and placed in a separate folder labeled Additional Statements (see section C.9). The candidate shall be informed of its inclusion and permitted an opportunity to place a statement in the file addressing this addition. All administrative parties (budget council/executive committee, department chair, college/school advisory committee, ORU director or dean) having already reviewed the dossier will also be notified of the inclusion of the additional materials. Notification is not necessary for the addition of required statements to the promotion dossier during the regular review process by a budget council/executive committee, department chair, ORU director or dean.
- d. Issues Beyond the Scope of the Promotion and Tenure Process. In rare cases, a tenure or promotion review may raise issues that the tenure and promotion process is not well suited to resolve. For example, an accusation about academic integrity may be relevant to a decision about tenure or promotion, but may be difficult to resolve adequately in the tenure and promotion process. In such cases, the chair or dean, in consultation with the provost and president, may delay the tenure and promotion process until the matter is resolved by an appropriate body separate from the tenure and promotion process.

B.2 CANDIDATE'S RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- a. Dossier Preparation. Candidates should familiarize themselves with these Guidelines and any other written guidelines provided by the department and/or college with respect to the promotion process and dossier assembly. Consult with the department chair (or designee) about the

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

relative responsibilities for compiling the information.

- b. Supplemental Materials. Candidates have the discretion to include any materials that they believe are relevant to the promotion or tenure decision (see section C.10).
- c. Review Referee List. The candidate shall provide the chair/budget council/executive committee with a list of recommended individuals to provide peer review letters (see section C.8.d). The candidate shall review the list of individuals selected prior to the chair or dean sending out the solicitation letter. Concerns about any reviewers on the list may be expressed to the department chair, but the department has final say over reviewer selection. The candidate may place a statement in the file to document any concerns he or she may have about reviewer selection (see Additional Statements, section C.9).
- d. Access to Promotion File Materials. Under state law, the university may not keep the contents of the promotion file confidential. A candidate may request and be allowed to inspect any material in his/her promotion dossier at any time during the promotion process.
 - i. Review of Materials. The candidate should check the materials in the promotion dossier before the departmental committee considers a case. The purpose of this review is to ensure that all candidate materials are enclosed in the dossier as submitted by the candidate. If the candidate believes that the file is incomplete or includes inappropriate material, or if the candidate has any other objection to the process, the chair, dean, or their designee shall either correct the problem or include a statement in the file about the problem and why it was not addressed as the candidate requested. The candidate may also place a statement in the file about the problem or other aspects of the case (see Additional Statements, section C.9).
 - ii. Informal Access. At any point in the process informal access to the promotion file is available to a candidate upon request as soon as is feasible, but not later than three (3) business days. Requests for informal access are to be addressed to the department chair, dean, or provost, as appropriate, and no formal open records request is required. Candidates shall be allowed to inspect/review their promotion files at each level with adequate supervision. Copying or photographing materials is not permitted, and no materials may be removed from the promotion files.
 - iii. Formal Access. If the candidate wishes to obtain copies of any materials in the file, the candidate must make a request in writing to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, which may be sent via email to evpp.aps@utlists.utexas.edu. Candidates should call (512) 232-3323 with any questions.

B.3 ASSESSMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. Conflict of Interest. A budget council/executive committee or college/school advisory committee member with a potential or real conflict of interest related to a candidate (e.g. spouse, Ph.D. advisor, etc.) is responsible for absenting him/herself from the room during the review and discussion of, and vote on, that candidate.
- b. Non-departmentalized College/School
 - 1) Budget Council/Executive Committee Assessment. The budget council or executive committee shall assess the record and prepare a separate statement for each area of contribution listed in section A.2 that is applicable to the candidate. Consideration should be given to the impact of a recommendation to promote, in particular how it would strengthen the college/school. Areas of distinction and potential weaknesses in the record should be identified, as well as the standards of the field. All votes (i.e., for, against, and abstentions) are to be recorded on the Recommendation for Change in Academic Rank/Status form

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

along with the number ineligible to vote and absent. In keeping with the tradition of academic integrity, the vote is taken after the evidence is compiled, not before, and 'follow-on' voting to achieve unanimity is not endorsed. As stipulated in [HOP 2-1310](#), associate and assistant professors are not eligible to vote on any matters affecting promotion from or continued appointment in their own rank or higher ranks, including the decision whether to develop a case for consideration (or reconsideration).

- 2) Dean's Assessment and Recommendation. The dean is to be present for the budget council/executive committee discussion of each case but does not vote. The dean is to provide his or her own assessment of the candidate's teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service, as applicable, and has the responsibility to describe fairly the rationale for the budget council/executive committee's recommendation, including a summary of the views of both opponents and proponents. Characterization of these discussions is neither to identify colleagues by name, nor otherwise impair the voting process. If the candidate is being reviewed for tenure, the dean must reflect on the mid-probationary review that must be included in the dossier. (If the written review is not included or available, that must be addressed in the dean's statement.) An effort should be made to explain negative votes and abstentions. The President's Committee will interpret unexplained abstentions as weak negative votes. The dean's statement should identify the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, provide context as needed, and address whether and how the candidate's promotion would improve the quality of the college/school. The signed statement is to accompany the dossier to the next level.

c. Departmentalized College/School:

- 1) Budget Council/Executive Committee Assessment. The budget council or executive committee shall assess the record and prepare a separate statement for each area of contribution listed in section A.2 that is applicable to the candidate. Consideration should be given to the impact of a recommendation to promote, in particular how it would strengthen the department. Areas of distinction and potential weaknesses in the record should be identified, as well as the standards of the field. All votes (i.e., for, against, and abstentions) are to be recorded on the Recommendation for Change in Academic Rank/Status form along with the number ineligible to vote and absent. In keeping with the tradition of academic integrity, the vote is taken after the evidence is compiled, not before, and 'follow-on' voting to achieve unanimity is not endorsed. As stipulated in [HOP 2-1310](#), associate and assistant professors are not eligible to vote on any matters affecting promotion from or continued appointment in their own rank or higher ranks, including the decision whether to develop a case for consideration (or reconsideration).
- 2) Department Chair's Assessment and Recommendation. The department chair is to be present for the budget council/executive committee discussion of each case but does not vote. The chair is to provide his or her own assessment of the candidate's teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service and has the responsibility to describe fairly the rationale for the budget council/executive committee's recommendation, including a summary of the views of both opponents and proponents. Characterization of these discussions is neither to identify colleagues by name, nor otherwise impair the voting process. If the candidate is being reviewed for tenure, the department chair must reflect on the mid-probationary review that must be included in the dossier. (If the written review is not included or available, that must be addressed in the department chair's statement.) An effort should be made to explain negative votes and abstentions. The President's Committee will interpret unexplained abstentions as weak negative votes. The department chair's statement should identify the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, provide context as needed, and address whether and how the candidate's promotion would improve the quality of the department. The signed statement is to accompany the dossier to the next level.
- 3) College Advisory Committee. The college advisory committee members should review dossiers before they meet, determine if any required materials are missing or incorrectly prepared, and, as necessary, notify the departments and candidates giving them a

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

reasonable opportunity to address any problems or concerns before the meeting to vote on the case. All votes (i.e., for, against, and abstentions) are to be recorded on the Recommendation for Change in Academic Rank/Status form along with the number ineligible to vote and absent.

- 4) Dean's Assessment. The dean is to be present for the discussions of the college advisory committee but does not vote. The dean is to provide his or her own assessment of the candidate's teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service and has the responsibility to describe fairly the rationale for the college advisory committee's recommendation, including a summary of the views of both opponents and proponents. Characterization of these discussions is neither to identify colleagues by name, nor otherwise impair the voting process. An effort should be made to explain negative votes and abstentions. The President's Committee will interpret unexplained abstentions as weak negative votes. The dean's statement should identify the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, provide context as needed, and address whether and how the candidate's promotion would advance the quality of the department and college/school. The signed statement is to accompany the dossier to the next level.

d. Other Affiliations:

- 1) Joint Positions. For faculty members with joint positions, each department is to submit forms and assessments and vote on the case, cross-referencing the other position. The departments involved are to share materials collected in support of the case. Where only one college is involved, the dossier is consolidated, with one college advisory committee vote and one dean's statement. Where two or more colleges/schools are involved, forms must be reviewed and acted upon by all deans concerned.
- 2) Courtesy Positions. Where a faculty member holds a courtesy position and has significant involvement in another department or center, that department chair or director is to provide a letter commenting on the involvement and contributions of the candidate to the programs of the department or center. The letter is included in the dossier following the dean's and the chair's statements.
- 3) Academic/Research Center, Laboratory, Bureau or Institute. If a faculty member is significantly engaged in the unit's activities but does not hold a courtesy position, the director may comment on the candidate's contributions to the unit. The commentary is included in the dossier following the dean's and chair's statements.
- 4) Research Faculty. For faculty in the research assistant and research associate professor titles, the director of the bureau, academic/research center, laboratory, or institute where the faculty member holds a position must provide an assessment of the candidate's research performance and other academic and professional contributions. The director's statement is to be provided to the department chair (dean in non-departmentalized colleges/schools) for consideration by the budget council/executive committee in its deliberations and a copy included in the dossier along with the statements of the department chair and dean.

e. Central Administration

- 1) Presidential Conferences. The dossiers will be discussed with the President's Review Committee at scheduled times in January and February. Each dean will attend the conference for his or her school or college. In particularly difficult cases, in order to make a determination in the best interest of the university, the president may request that formal assessments of a candidate's contributions and achievements be sought from additional experts in the field, or that key stakeholders be invited to address questions not resolved by the record presented or in the conference with the dean. See section D for announcement of decisions.

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

Section C Dossier Assembly (See Appendix A for a summary)

To facilitate the review process and to ensure completeness and consistency, the dossier is to be assembled in the order and with the supporting documentation specified in this section.

C.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

This section includes the supporting documents related to departmental and college recommendations as described in section B.3 They are to be placed in the following order:

- Recommendation for Change in Academic Rank/Status form
- Dean's statement
- Department chair's statement
- Copy of the mid-probationary review (only applicable for tenure candidates)
- Joint department chair's statement (if applicable)
- Courtesy department chair or center director's statement(s) (if applicable)
- Other academic program and/or research center director's statement(s) (if applicable)

C.2 CURRICULUM VITAE AND OTHER INFORMATION

This section includes the supporting documentation related to the curriculum vitae.

a. Curriculum Vitae. The candidate's dossier is to include a curriculum vitae (as opposed to a continuous faculty record), containing, among other things, a list of:

- degrees, fields of study, and dates awarded
- professional registrations, licensures, certifications (as applicable)
- all professional appointments
- complete publications record with:
 - publications and other evidence of scholarship/creativity listed according to the kind of entry (e.g., books, chapters, articles, reports, proceedings, and other materials)
 - refereed works identified as such
 - the names of the co-authors listed in the order in which they appear in the publication
 - clear designation of the faculty member's role if it is not author (e.g., editor, compiler, translator, or some other role)
 - works that are in preparation, submitted, under review, accepted, under contract or in press clearly labeled accordingly (for works under contract and/or in press, include tentative publication date)
 - beginning and ending page numbers for articles and total number of pages for books
- scholarly presentations
- research contracts/grants/gifts and proposals submitted with:
 - sponsor name
 - project title
 - project/funding period
 - co-PIs and relative effort of each, where appropriate
 - funding amounts (by academic year and amount under candidate's supervision)
 - for proposals, an indication of the status of each (e.g., submitted, approved, funding pending)
- patents issued (as applicable)
- all advising and related student service
- administrative and committee service, and academic-related professional and public service
- other evidence of merit or recognition

Do not duplicate sections from the CV in other parts of the dossier unless specified in these guidelines.

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

- b. Complete list of publications and scholarly/creative works. Provide a separate document, using the template provided by the Provost's Office, listing all publications and scholarly/creative work published (or in an equivalent status) in reverse chronological order.

All candidates for tenure must list their dissertation/thesis title and dissertation/thesis advisor's name on the document (if applicable).

Works should be grouped into four sections as applicable and co-authors who were in a student or other trainee status at the time of submission should be noted in *italics*:

1. Works published (or in equivalent status), in press, accepted, or under contract while in current rank at UT Austin
2. Works published (or in equivalent status) while in current rank at other institutions
3. Works published (or in equivalent status) while in previous ranks at UT Austin
4. Works published (or in equivalent status) while in previous ranks at other institutions

Co-authored works listed in section 1 should indicate who the co-authors are and their status at the time of submission (e.g., current or former students, peers or faculty colleagues at UT Austin or at another institution). Include a brief qualitative statement of contribution for each co-authored work.

Forthcoming works that are in press, accepted, or under contract should be listed in section 1 and clearly labeled. Each forthcoming work should be supported by clearly labeled letters of acceptance or copies of contracts from editors, publishing houses, producers, galleries, or other conduits for scholarly and/or creative work. Include reviews, where available.

C.3 TEACHING

- a. Budget Council/Executive Committee Statement. The budget council/executive committee must provide a separate document assessing teaching performance that includes both the signatures and typed names of those responsible for preparing it. The statement is required for all tenured, tenure-track, lecturer, clinical and adjunct faculty, as well as research professor faculty that have been assigned a teaching role. The document is to provide an explanation of the evaluation procedures and measures used and the assessment should:

- discuss both student course/instructor evaluations and peer observation reports
- discuss the candidate's willingness to teach courses for which there is strong student demand
- describe the balance between undergraduate and graduate teaching, as applicable
- discuss relevant evidence of merit or recognition for teaching excellence
- describe and provide documentation of organized service learning instruction, as applicable
- reflect familiarity with the teaching portfolio
- describe participation on graduate committees
- describe supervision of postdoctoral students, as applicable
- consider any special circumstances concerning the faculty member's teaching performance, including any innovative contributions described (e.g., innovative teaching methods, use of instructional technology, interdisciplinary teaching, innovative curriculum development activities, supervision of undergraduate special project courses)

In addition to the budget council/executive committee assessment, the teaching section of each candidate's dossier must contain the following supporting documentation:

- b. Teaching Statement. The candidate must provide in four (4) pages or less a personal statement of teaching philosophy, educational goals for the courses taught and how they were

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

accomplished, description of any innovations or unique methods, specific areas of demonstrated improvement, and other material in a manner that will provide colleagues with a context for interpreting other evaluative information.

- c. Course Rating Averages. Each department or college should prepare a report of course rating averages using the Provost's Office template. Classes should be grouped by course and listed in chronological order. The class size, number of Course-Instructor Survey (CIS) responses, instructor rating, and course rating should be provided for each class taught.
- d. Candidate's Instructional Activities. Each department or college/school will need to download a Summary of Recent Course-Instructor Survey Results through the Spring 2018 term for each faculty member being considered for promotion as reported by the dean. This download is available in the university's Faculty Information System. The summary will be based on the basic and expanded CIS forms and will include the applicable period for each candidate.

Candidates for tenure and
instructors to assistant:

Entire probationary period

All other candidates:

Previous three years (i.e., 2015-16 through 2017-18)

The deans and department chairs should download this information in early June and in early September, and use the summary to comply with this requirement, where possible. This report can be used to complete the Course Rating Averages chart (see section C.3.c).

If the dean chooses not to use the downloaded summary, or candidates did not use the basic or expanded form, then the dean is responsible for developing a format for college-wide use.

- e. Peer Classroom Observation Reports. These reports are broad observations of the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher at the graduate and/or undergraduate levels by those faculty members conducting the in-class observations. The reports should cover such elements as presentation, course content, organization, clarity of written materials, rigor and fairness of written examinations, appropriateness of methodology, and student outcomes.

Peer observations of classes should be carried out repeatedly in the evaluation period of the candidate, ideally in the same class over the course of multiple semesters. Particular attention should be paid to giving constructive advice during early observations, then following up with specific progress reports in subsequent semesters observing the same class. Include in the dossier all reports of in-class observations conducted while in rank. Observation reports for the fall semester during which the candidate for promotion is expected to be reviewed (i.e., Fall 2018) should not be used unless absolutely necessary (i.e., this is the only semester for which the observation is possible). The budget council/executive committee is to consider the peer observations in their assessment of the candidate's teaching service record. Each peer observation report is to include:

- number and title of course observed
- date of report
- date of classroom observation
- description of methods by which instructor engages students in learning
- date on which the observation was discussed with the candidate
- constructive advice
- any specific improvement from previous peer observation reports
- name and signature of observer(s)

UT Austin's Faculty Innovation Center has resources regarding Peer Review of Teaching:
<https://facultyinnovate.utexas.edu/opportunities/prof-dev/peer-observation>

- f. Report of graduate student supervision as provided by the Graduate School via the Committee

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

Report on Masters and Doctoral Theses. The Provost's Office will distribute this report to the deans and department chairs in early September for each faculty member being considered for promotion as reported by the dean. If none were supervised, insert separate page with the statement, "No graduate students were supervised."

- g. Postdoctoral Fellows Supervised. Provide a list of postdoctoral fellows supervised with name, institution awarding the Ph.D., and date conferred. If none were supervised, insert separate page with the statement, "No postdoctoral fellows were supervised."
- h. Originals of all Students' Written Comments for the last three years (i.e., 2015-16 through 2017-18) are to be included with Supplemental Materials (See section C.10). The Course Instructor Survey Summary evaluation page should be included as a coversheet for each class. Candidates who have taught at other institutions during the last three years may submit evaluations from those courses.
- i. Teaching Portfolio. The candidate (including research faculty whose assigned duties include teaching) is to develop an extensive teaching portfolio for department or college/school review. The portfolio does not accompany the dossier beyond the dean's office.

For information on compiling a teaching portfolio, candidates for promotion should consult with their department chairs and dean's office. The following items are examples of materials appropriate for a portfolio: syllabi, handouts, problem sets, and other written materials developed for courses; computer-assisted instructional aids; examinations.

UT Austin's Faculty Innovation Center has resources available on their website at: <https://facultyinnovate.utexas.edu/opportunities/prof-dev/portfolio>

C.4 RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- a. Budget Council/Executive Committee Statement. The budget council/executive committee is to summarize research/scholarly/creative contributions in a separate document that includes the typed names and signatures of the members responsible for preparing the statement. The statement is required for all tenured, tenure-track, and research professor faculty as well as faculty in lecturer, clinical and adjunct titles for whom this is one of the areas of performance excellence selected for review. The summary statement should:

- describe which area(s) of the field is the focus of the faculty member's work
- identify and comment on those items that are considered to be of major significance or outstanding quality while in rank at UT Austin or since the most recent promotion, as appropriate.
- describe how the budget council/executive committee evaluators conducted their review, including the standards used
- be clear about the norms of the field and indicate, for example, the quality of the outlets for a candidate's work (i.e., journals, presses, art galleries, performance venues, etc.)
- explain the norms of co-authorship, where applicable, and whether a peer review was involved
- explain, where applicable, reasons for counting non-traditional outlets favorably for research/scholarly/creative activity, (e.g., textbooks, continuing education presentations, governmental or industrial service, etc.)
- describe how the candidate's research fits within the context of their field and explain it in a way that is accessible to those outside of their field
- for tenure-track candidates, assess the level of independent scholarly activity while at UT Austin
- for tenure-track candidates with a book publication, indicate whether the book is derived from the doctoral dissertation, and if so, to what extent it has been expanded or modified

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

- b. Scholarly Works. Copies of scholarly works must accompany the dossier as far as the Dean's Office. The dean is responsible for ensuring that the scholarly works correspond to the vitae.
- Candidates being considered for tenure include all scholarly works.
 - Other candidates include all scholarly works produced while in rank.
- c. Five Most Significant Works. The internal and external review may concentrate on a smaller set of publications that are considered to be the most significant. The candidate is to make the selection of the five most significant works. Tenured associate professor candidates for promotion to full professor should select the five most significant works while in their current rank. Include a listing of the five works in the dossier.
- One set of the five most significant works should accompany the dossier as far as the central administration. Include reviews, when available. Place them with the other supplemental materials (see section C.9), not in the dossier.
- d. Research Statement. The candidate must provide in four (4) pages or less a statement of accomplishments, goals, and future plans in the area of research, scholarship, and creativity. Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor should focus primarily on accomplishments since first appointment as assistant professor (which may include work as an assistant professor at another institution), and are encouraged to articulate a plan for sustaining their program. All other candidates should focus primarily on accomplishments while in rank and future plans.

C.5 ACADEMIC ADVISING, COUNSELING, AND OTHER STUDENT SERVICES

- a. Budget Council/Executive Committee Statement. The budget council/executive committee is to summarize academic advising responsibilities in a separate document that includes the signatures and typed names of those preparing it. The statement is required for all tenured, tenure-track, and research professor faculty as well as faculty in lecturer, clinical and adjunct titles for whom this is one of the areas of performance excellence selected for review. The statement should describe and assess responsibilities at both the undergraduate and graduate levels during at least the last three years of service (where applicable) and describe other activities in support of the instructional process. Items to be considered in the assessment:
- how the candidate has assisted in advising undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral students
 - service as undergraduate adviser or graduate adviser is especially noteworthy and deserves particular attention
 - individual instruction
 - advising majors for registration
 - orientation activities for new students
 - offering advice to students considering advanced degrees
 - offering help with internships and job placement
 - advising student organizations
 - student recruitment and retention activities

C.6 SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY AND TO THE NATION, STATE AND COMMUNITY

- a. Budget Council/Executive Committee Statement. The budget council/executive committee is to summarize service in a separate document that includes the signatures and typed names of those preparing it. The statement is required for all tenured, tenure-track, and research professor faculty as well as faculty in lecturer, clinical and adjunct titles for whom this is one of the areas of performance excellence selected for review. The statement should address the candidate's contributions in the two broad service areas during at least the last three years, describe the nature of activities cited in support of the recommendation, and assess the quality

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

of the service contributions.

- 1) Administrative and Committee Service. Positions of leadership, such as chairing a committee, are to be noted in particular.
- 2) Academic and Professionally Related Public Service. Outstanding service in scholarly or professional organizations, in particular, and its significance should be noted, for example, whether an editorship is of a highly respected refereed journal, or whether an elected office is in a significant scholarly organization. A distinction is to be made between editorship of a journal and membership on a large editorial board.

Note: Significant administrative and committee service to the department, college, or university along with academic or professionally related public service activities is to be listed in the curriculum vitae (see section C.2).

C.7 HONORS AND OTHER EVIDENCE OF MERIT OR RECOGNITION, INCLUDING CONTRACTS AND GRANTS

- a. Budget Council/Executive Committee Statement. The budget council/executive committee is to summarize honors in a separate document that includes the signatures and typed names of those preparing it. The statement is required for all tenured, tenure-track, and research professor faculty as well as faculty in lecturer, clinical and adjunct titles for whom this is one of the areas of performance excellence selected for review. The statement should describe and assess the relevant evidence of exceptional academic or professional merit, as manifested by contracts and grants, medals, fellowships, invitations to speak (e.g., at other universities, at professional society meetings, and in other venues), election to office in scholarly or professional organizations, or other honors received.
 - 1) Special Honors. Departmental statements on special honors should note the relative prestige of any honors or other professional recognition that the candidate may have received. It is important to distinguish between those awards made on the basis of promise and those awarded on the basis of accomplishment.
 - 2) External Funding. Actively seeking and successfully obtaining external funding is a consideration for promotion in those departments where external funding is the norm. If external funding is not the norm, a comment to that effect should be part of the department's statement.

C.8 LETTERS OF REFERENCE/RECOMMENDATION/EVALUATION

- a. Tenured and Tenure-Track Titles. A minimum of five external review letters must be compiled that evaluate the contributions and accomplishments of the candidate. All letters must come from external reviewers from peer institutions/programs who have an understanding of the academic setting and the standards against which the area benchmarks itself. The emphasis of the review is to evaluate the research/scholarly/creative contributions and other accomplishment of the candidate, and to summarize his or her professional standing.
- b. Non-Tenure Track Titles (except Research Titles). A minimum of four review letters must be compiled that evaluate the contributions and accomplishments of the candidate. All four letters may come from internal reviewers unless research/scholarly/creative contribution is one of the areas selected for review, in which case two of the four letters must be from external reviewers. All contributions and accomplishments of these candidates should be evaluated where applicable, but special emphasis should be given to teaching performance and the other principal contribution area(s) selected.
- c. Research Professor Titles. A minimum of four review letters must be compiled that evaluate

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

the contributions and accomplishments of the candidate. At least three of the four letters must come from external reviewers. The emphasis of the review is on research performance and the candidate's overall academic-related service.

- d. Responsibility for finalizing a list of appropriate external reviewers rests with the department chair/budget council/executive committee. The candidate and the chair/budget council/executive committee shall separately develop a list of arm's length external reviewers using the following considerations:
- seek out credible reviewers knowledgeable about the scholarly expectations of a peer research university
 - avoid conflicts of interest, e.g., dissertation chairs, postdoctoral mentors, co-authors, co-principal investigators, and collaborators
 - use recognized experts at peer institutions
 - letters solicited from collaborators must be placed in a separate section (e.g. Supplemental Materials, see section C.10.b) and will not count toward the minimum number of letters that are required
 - explanation for any deviations from these considerations (e.g., why a letter writer from a non-peer institution was chosen, etc.) must be provided on the Chart of Reviewers (see section C.8.e)

The candidate must be given the opportunity to review the list of outside reviewers and then the dean (or designee) must approve the final list of letter writers before the solicitation letter is sent (see sections B.1.a and B.2.c).

Solicitation Letter. Sample letters for departments and schools to use in soliciting letters from reviewers are available from the Provost's Office. Departments and colleges/schools may tailor these letters to their individual circumstances. However, all referees must be informed that, under Texas law, we cannot ensure the confidentiality of letters from reviewers. Letter writers also must be informed of any extension to the probationary period.

- e. Chart of Reviewers. All solicited review letters received concerning a candidate must be included in the candidate's dossier. The department is to prepare chart of all reviewers solicited using the template provided by the Provost's Office. Group by Received, Declined, and No Response, and list in alphabetical order by last name within each group providing the following information:
- name and rank or title of reviewer
 - name of institution (including the department) or other agency with which the reviewer is affiliated
 - brief statement about why the individual was selected
 - other relevant information about the reviewer that would assist those involved in the process who are not practitioner's in the candidate's field
 - indicate whether selected by department or candidate
 - indicate date received for letters and declinations
 - include the reason for declination, if provided
 - explanation for any deviations from those considerations listed in section C.8.d.
- f. Sample Letter. Insert a sample of the solicitation letter(s) sent to the reviewers, including a list of the five most significant works and any other materials that were sent for evaluation.
- g. Letters Received. The majority of the received review letters should be from reviewers nominated solely by the department. Place the letters in alphabetical order by last name. Make note in the upper right-hand corner of the first page of each letter whether the budget council/executive committee, candidate, or both, nominated the letter writer. This notation should match the information provided on chart of reviewers.

All solicited letters received must be included in the candidate's dossier. A short version of the referee's CV or résumé is to be included behind each letter.

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

- h. Declinations. (If applicable.) Place declination correspondence in alphabetical order by last name behind the letters received. A CV is not required.
- i. Unsolicited letters. (If received.) Place the letters in alphabetical order by last name. A CV is not required.

C.9 ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

Any additional, non-required statements added to the file as a result of the candidate's review before budget council/executive committee deliberations (sections B.1.b and B.2.d.i) or received after the candidate's review (section B.1.c) shall be date stamped and placed in a separate folder.

C.10 SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Supplemental materials shall accompany the promotion file at each level of review and be made available to all internal parties to whom its content is relevant for their review, deliberations and/or vote. Supplemental materials should be submitted to the central administration electronically in UT Box. (The Dean's Office should consult with the Provost's Office before making an exception to this requirement.)

- a. Student Written Comments. As stated in section C.3.h, include originals of all students' written comments for the last three years (i.e., 2015-16 through 2017-18). The Course Instructor Survey Summary evaluation page should be included as a coversheet for each class. Candidates who have taught at other institutions during the last three years may submit evaluations from those courses.
- b. Letters Solicited from Collaborators. The department is to prepare a separate chart of reviewers for letters solicited from collaborators, listed in alphabetical order by last name, using the template provided by the Provost's Office. Letters solicited from collaborators must be placed behind the chart of reviewers in a section separate from those solicited from arm's length reviewers and will not count toward the minimum number of letters that are required (see section C.8.d). A CV is not required.
- c. Other Supplemental Materials. In addition to the required materials described in these Guidelines, candidates have the discretion to include any materials that they believe are relevant to the promotion or tenure decision. Provide a table of contents as a coversheet to the other supplemental materials.
- d. Five Most Significant Works. As stated in section C.4.c, one set of the five most significant works should accompany the dossier as far as the central administration.

Section D **Outcomes**

D.1 ANNOUNCEMENT OF DECISIONS

The Office of the President will formally notify deans of the results of the spring promotion conferences, including those pending cases where an action of terminal appointment is being considered. Every effort will be made to do so no later than Friday, February 15, 2019. Deans shall ensure that candidates are informed of the decisions made about their cases within three (3) business days of receiving notification from the president.

The President's Committee will revisit all terminal appointment pending cases in April. Final arguments (see section D.2), if submitted, will be considered at this time. The president will endeavor to notify deans of the final action on Terminal Appointment Pending cases by Friday, April 12, 2019.

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

D.2 FINAL ARGUMENTS IN TERMINAL APPOINTMENT PENDING CASES

A candidate whose case is Terminal Appointment Pending may present further arguments to the president before the case is decided. Address final arguments to the president and deliver (hard copy) to the Provost's Office, Main Building 201, or electronic copy to evpp.aps@utlists.utexas.edu by Monday, March 25, 2019. The president will refer the written arguments to the department and college/school for additional comment before reaching a final decision.

D.3 REQUEST FOR REVIEW BY COMMITTEE OF COUNSEL ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY (CCAFR)

The candidate or the president may request a review of the case by the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR). Such a review is limited to one or both of the following: 1) to determine whether, in its judgment, the procedures followed in the candidate's case accorded with both the university's and commonly accepted professional standards for promotion and tenure; and 2) whether the decision was based upon a violation of the faculty member's academic freedom. CCAFR shall not review disputes about professional judgments on the merits of the faculty member's record.

A request for review shall describe the procedural irregularity being asserted and/or the alleged violation of academic freedom being asserted and how it impacted the decision. Candidates have until Monday, March 25, 2019, to submit a request for review to CCAFR (Office of the General Faculty, WMB 2.102, F9500) and provide a copy to the provost (MAI 201, G1000 or evpp.aps@utlists.utexas.edu). The provost's office will distribute copies of the request to the dean and department chair.

CCAFR may delegate its work to a subcommittee of no fewer than three members. CCAFR shall report to the president, with a copy to the candidate, by Friday, April 19, 2019. The president will consider the subcommittee's report and advise CCAFR of the outcome of the case. The president may extend the time for the subcommittee to perform its work.

D.4 RECONSIDERATION OF A PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISION IN THE TERMINAL YEAR

The university has no obligation to provide a faculty member with reconsideration of a tenure decision during the terminal year, however, a department may request it based on submission of substantial new evidence by the candidate. The department is responsible for assessing whether new evidence of productivity presented by a candidate is substantial in nature and sufficiently compelling to merit reconsideration of the decision. Such a review is to examine any new evidence (i.e., evidence not previously considered) to determine whether it clearly demonstrates that the decision made the prior year should be reversed.

If a determination of compelling new evidence is made in a terminal year case, the department will prepare a new promotion file focusing on the new evidence and submit this, along with the previous year's dossier, to each level in the review process. The budget council/executive committee shall prepare an assessment of the new evidence put forward in each area of contribution.

Reconsideration during the terminal appointment year does not entitle a candidate to an additional terminal year.

D.5 GRIEVANCES

- a) Use of Grievance Process. 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](#).
- b) Grievance of a Terminal Appointment Decision. An individual who alleges evidence of an infringement of the Constitution or laws of Texas or the United States may present a grievance in person or through a representative, to the provost, who shall meet with the faculty member.

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

A faculty member may request a review by a hearing tribunal by submitting a written request to the president describing in detail the facts relied upon to prove that the decision was made for reasons that are unlawful. If the president determines that the alleged facts, if proven by credible evidence, support a conclusion that the decision was made for unlawful reasons, such allegations shall be heard by a hearing tribunal in accordance with procedures in [Regent's Rule 31008](#) (see section 6) and the institutional faculty grievance procedure [HOP 2-2310](#).

D.6 RESOURCES

- For assistance with the General Guidelines or the promotion and tenure process generally: Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost at (512) 471-3007 or evpp.aps@utlists.utexas.edu
- To speak with a neutral third party about individual concerns: Faculty Ombudsperson at (512) 471-5866
- For questions about procedural or academic freedom concerns: Chair of the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCA FR) through the Office of the General Faculty at (512) 471-5934

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

**Appendix A
Summary of Dossier Preparation and UT Box PDF File Names and Contents**

Dossier Folder	
PDF File Name in UT Box	PDF Document Contents
01_Change of Rank Form.pdf	Change in Academic Rank/Status Form
02_Dean Statement.pdf	Statement from the Dean
03a_Chair Statement Primary.pdf	Statement from the Chair of the Primary Department
03b_Chair Statement Joint.pdf	Statement from the Chair of the Joint Department (If applicable)
04_Mid-Probationary Review.pdf	Copy of Mid-Probationary Review (Only applicable for tenure candidates)
05a,b,c_Other Statement_CSU Title.pdf	Statement from the Courtesy or Other Department Chair/Center Director (If applicable). Statements from units where the candidate holds a courtesy appointment should appear before statements from other departments.
06_CV.pdf	Curriculum Vitae
07_Scholarly Record.pdf	<p>Complete list of all publications and scholarly/creative works published (or in an equivalent status) in reverse chronological order and grouped into four sections as applicable:</p> <p>Candidate's dissertation/thesis title and dissertation/thesis advisor's name (Only applicable for tenure candidates)</p> <p>Co-authors who were in a student or other trainee status at the time of submission should be noted in <i>italics</i>.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Works published (or in equivalent status), in press, accepted, or under contract while in current rank at UT Austin 2. Works published (or in equivalent status) while in current rank at other institutions 3. Works published (or in equivalent status) while in previous ranks at UT Austin 4. Works published (or in equivalent status) while in previous ranks at other institutions <p>Co-authored works listed in section 1 should indicate who the co-authors are (e.g., current or former students, peers or faculty colleagues at UT Austin or at another institution). Include a <u>brief</u> qualitative statement of contribution for each co-authored work.</p> <p>Forthcoming works that are In Press, Accepted, or Under contract should be listed in section 1 and clearly labeled. Include clearly labeled supporting documentation (e.g., contracts from editors, publishing houses, producers, galleries, or other conduits for scholarly and/or creative work, and include reviews, where available).</p>

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

Dossier Folder (continued)	
PDF File Name in UT Box	PDF Document Contents
08_Teaching Statements.pdf	Budget council/executive committee statement with typed names and signatures of preparers Candidate Statement (four pages or less; does not have to be signed)
09_CIS.pdf	Report of Course Rating Averages Summary of Course Instructor Survey Results
10_Peer Teaching Observations.pdf	Peer Observation Reports
11_Graduate Students and Postdocs	Committee Report of Masters and Doctoral Theses Listing of Postdoctoral Fellows Supervised
12_Research.pdf	Budget council/executive committee statement with typed names and signatures of preparers List of Five Most Significant Works Candidate Statement (four pages or less; does not have to be signed)
13_Advising, Service, and Honors.pdf	Budget council/executive committee statement on advising with typed names and signatures of preparers* Candidate Statement on Advising (If submitted) Budget council/executive committee statement on service with typed names and signatures of preparers* Candidate Statement on Service (If submitted) Budget council/executive committee statement on honors with typed names and signatures of preparers* Candidate Statement on Honors (If submitted)
14_Chart of Reviewers, Sample Letter, Materials Sent.pdf	Chart of Reviewers grouped by Received, Declined, and No Response listed in alphabetical order by last name within each group Sample of Solicitation Letter List of Five Most Significant Works and any other materials that were sent for evaluation

*The budget council/executive committee statements on Advising, Service, and Honors are required for tenured, tenure track, and research professor faculty as well as faculty in lecturer, clinical, and adjunct titles for whom this is one of the areas of performance excellence selected for review.

GENERAL GUIDELINES 2018-19

Dossier Folder (continued)	
PDF File Name in UT Box	PDF Document Contents
15a,b,c_Ltr_Last name-Institution.pdf	Letters in alphabetical order by last name - coded in upper right-hand corner of the first page of each letter whether the budget council/executive committee, candidate, or both, nominated the letter writer. Must match the information provided on the chart of reviewers. Letter writer CV or resume behind each letter.
16_Declinations.pdf	All declinations correspondence in alphabetical order by last name (if received). No CV required.
17_Unsolicited.pdf	All unsolicited letters in alphabetical order by last name (if received). No CV required.

Additional Statements	
This is a separate folder that should only be created if applicable.	
PDF File Name in UT Box	PDF Document Contents
Additional Statement_ccyy-mm-dd Last name.pdf	Any non-required statements or information added to the file as a result of the candidate's review before the budget council/executive committee deliberations or received afterwards during the course of the review process.

Supplemental Materials	
This is a separate folder and all supplemental materials must be submitted to the central administration electronically in UT Box. (The Dean's Office should consult with the Provost's Office before making an exception to this requirement.)	
PDF File Name in UT Box	PDF Document Contents
01a,b,c_Student Comments_SEMESTER NAMEYY-Course#.pdf	The Course Instructor Survey Summary evaluation page should be included as a cover sheet for each class.
02_Letters Solicited from Collaborators.pdf	Chart of collaborators listed in alphabetical order by last name. All solicited letters in alphabetical order by last name behind the chart (If received). No CV required.
03_Other Supplemental Material.pdf	Items submitted by the candidate - should include a table of contents (If submitted)
04a,b,c_Significant Publication (##-Title).pdf	Significant Publication
05a,b,c_Other Publication (##-Title).pdf	Other Publication submitted by the candidate (Stays in the Dean's Office)
06_Teaching Portfolio.pdf	Teaching Portfolio (Stays in the Dean's Office)

^{*}This item is required for tenured, tenure track, and research professor faculty as well as faculty in lecturer, clinical, and adjunct titles for whom research is one of the areas of performance excellence selected for review.