DOSSIER-PROMOTION PACKET-TABBED SECTIONS CHECKLIST

NON TENURE TRACK TITLE SERIES (NOT INCLUDING RESEARCH PROFESSORS)

General Responsibilities

1. Before a department reviews a candidate’s file, the department chair or their designee shall meet with the candidate to explain the promotion process.

2. Candidates have a right to check the materials in the promotion dossier (except for internal and external reviews of teaching, scholarship, and service) before it is reviewed by the departmental committee and to ask for correction of problems discovered. The chair shall either correct the problem or provide a statement about the problem and why it was not addressed. The candidate may also place a statement in the file addressing the problem or other aspects of the case.
   - To aid in complying with this, a “Promotion Candidate File Check Form” is available at http://www.utexas.edu/provost/policies/evaluation/tenure/promote_tenure.html. This form is to be given to the candidate and signed by the appropriate parties.

3. While the promotion review process is helped by confidentiality and the candidate does not normally examine internal or external reviews, if the candidate requests it, the chair shall inform the candidate about specific recommendations.

4. Under State law, the candidate has the right to review the entire substantive content of the promotion review file and may do so by making a written request to the chair or dean. The candidate may not copy materials in the file without making a formal request under the Open Records Act.

5. Budget Council members prepare assessments for each section.
   - The principal role of non-tenure track faculty in the Lecturer, Adjunct, and Clinical titles is the provision of 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. In addition, a record of accomplishment in at least one of the other areas of service consistent with the terms of employment is required and must be documented in appropriate ways.
   - A complete and objective evaluation by faculty of a candidate’s case for promotion is essential for maintaining the quality of the University. The Budget Council evaluation is the key step in determining the suitability for promotion based on the record presented in the case and the potential for future growth as a scholar and teacher.
   - Budget Council members’ statements are to evaluate the record compared to the norms of the field and a balancing of the good aspects of the candidate’s record as well as the not so good. Departmental and School norms should be cited so the performance of the candidate against those norms can be understood by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the President’s Committee.
   - The Budget Council members’ assessments should be thorough, focusing on the quality of the teaching, the impact and significance of the publications to the candidate’s field, the record of external support for research, and the caliber of professional and university service, including whether leadership has been demonstrated in appropriate ways, and honors and awards, as applicable to the specific lecturer case.
   - The department representative on the Promotion & Tenure Committee should not be involved in the preparation of the Budget Council assessments.

6. When describing work done in collaboration with others, the candidate must delineate in their statement between their contributions and those of the others so that the Budget Council, Promotion & Tenure Committee, and the President’s Committee are able to judge the specific achievements of the candidate.

7. For faculty being considered for promotion to Distinguished Senior Lecturer, the candidate must limit their statements to their work while in the rank of Senior Lecturer. For those being considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer, the candidate must limit their statements to their work while in the rank of Lecturer.

8. Departments are expected to find and make typographical and grammatical corrections in the statements and in the candidate’s curriculum vitae before the dossier is submitted to the Academic Affairs Office. They are also expected to insure that all items listed below are included in the dossier.
Packet preparation: please put items in the order as they appear on this checklist. **Do not include any coversheets of any kind. Do not use any kind of bindings: no staples, no paperclips, nothing.**

For the first round of review in the dean’s office submit one **working** copy of the tabbed dossier and all of the supplemental materials. I will return this copy to you **along with a detailed list of changes to make.** After reviewing and making the requested changes to your original and the working copy, please return the working copy and the list of changes marked with your initials acknowledging that you made each change on your original dossier and **have submitted the copy to me.** After final changes are made, and for submission to the Provost’s Office, we will need the original and 5 copies of the tabbed dossier only. No additional copies of the supplemental material required. **The working copy that I have will count as one of the copies.**

**Recommendation for Change in Academic Rank/Status**

- must be completed by department
- “probationary status” for non tenure track faculty is “no”. Be sure to include the current year in the number of years of service.
- Definition of Years in Rank: September 1 of when the rank changed to September of when the promotion will be effective.
- if department has more than one candidate, the budget council vote on all of the forms should equal the same total number, please check. Need to include abstentions.
- Budget Council vote is NOT to include Chair’s vote
- form can be found at http://www.utexas.edu/provost/policies/evaluation/tenure/rank.html

**Chair’s Statement**

- statement is to include the typed name and the signature of the chair
- rationale for Budget Council’s recommendation
- summary of views of opponents and proponents (discussion of vote/decision to recommend for promotion)
- include description of how promotion of candidate would/would not support the academic unit's goal
- if particular groups within the Budget Council (NAE members, etc.) expressed strong views - these should be collectively summarized
- provide Chair’s independent assessment of candidate's overall performance and accomplishments as a member of the academic community, which are distinct from the assessment of the Budget Council, include a review of the achievements and contributions in the following areas, **but must include teaching and at least one other area:**
  - teaching, both undergraduate and graduate, **required**
  - research, creative, and other scholarly activities, **as applicable**
  - advising, counseling and other student service, **as applicable**
  - administrative and committee service, public service of an academic or professional nature to the nation, state and local community, **as applicable**
  - other evidence of merit or recognition such as fellowships, grants, disclosures, patents pending, patents awarded, honors, and election to office in scholarly or professional organizations, **as applicable**

**Director Statement (if applicable)**

- if a non-tenure track faculty member is significantly engaged in the activities of a bureau, academic/research center, laboratory or institute, the director of the unit should have an opportunity to comment to the Department Chair on the recommendation for promotion. Statement is to include the typed name and the signature of the director of academic program and/or research center in which the faculty member is actively involved. This commentary is to follow the dean’s and chair’s statement.

**Joint Appointment/Courtesy Appointment Statements (if applicable)**

- for those faculty with appointments in two or more departments, each department is to submit forms and assessments and vote on the case, with cross-referencing of the joint appointment. The departments are to share materials collected in support of the case.
- Where two or more colleges/schools are involved, forms must be reviewed and acted on by all deans concerned.
- Where the faculty member holds a courtesy (0%) appointment in another department, that Department Chair is to be asked to comment on the involvement and contributions of the candidate and a copy of that commentary is to follow the dean’s and chair’s statements.
1. Curriculum vitae, faculty annual reports & other information (required)

Candidate: Curriculum vitae (same as Cockrell School of Engineering standard format)

- List of degrees, fields of study, and dates awarded
- Professional registrations, licensures, certifications (as applicable)
- Listing of all professional appointments
- Complete publications record
  - Publications and other evidence of scholarship/creativity listed according to the kind of entry, e.g., books, reports, chapters, articles, and other materials
  - Refereed works identified as such
  - Names of co-authors listed in the order in which they appear in the publication
  - Beginning and ending page numbers for articles
  - Total number of pages for books
  - Clear designation of faculty member's role if it is not author (e.g., editor, compiler, translator, or some other role)
  - Works that are in preparation, under review, under contract, forthcoming, in press, accepted or under submission should be clearly labeled accordingly. (For works under contract and/or in press, include tentative publication date)
  - Scholarly presentations
  - Research contracts/grants and proposals submitted with:
    - Sponsor name
    - Project title
    - Project period
    - Co-PIs and relative effort of each, where appropriate
    - Funding amounts (by academic year and amount under candidate’s supervision)
    - Total funding amount, while in rank, and total career (amount under candidate’s supervision and proposal total)
    - For proposals, an indication of the status of each (e.g., submitted, approved, pending funding)
    - List of all advising and related student service (indicate whether PhD’s have reached candidacy)
  - List of administrative and committee service for at least last three years
  - List of academic-related professional and public service
  - List of merits or recognition
  - Disclosures, patents pending, and patents awarded (as applicable)

Candidate: Other

- Document identifying who co-authors are (example: faculty colleague from A & M, current or former student, former classmate, peer or faculty colleagues at UT Austin or another institution, etc.)
- For co-authored works involving faculty colleagues or peers, indicate relative division of labor (only for refereed journal pubs and conf. proceedings for last 3-4 yrs, not needed for those with teaching assistants/students)
- For works that have been accepted, are under contract or are in press, but not yet published, letters of acceptance or copies of contracts from editors, publishing houses, producers, galleries or other conduits for scholarly and/or creative work are to be submitted with the file. Reviews, where available, should be included. If including the article as proof, instead of acceptance letter, only first page of article showing the publication information is needed (not entire article).

Candidate: Faculty Annual reports

- Copies of Faculty Annual Reports for last three years (and three years only—2009-10, 2008-09, 2007-08).
- Copies of departmental Short Forms (if applicable) for last three years (please do a "sanity check" to make sure the numbers are accumulated properly over the three years)
- Put copies of Faculty Annual Reports in descending order

2. Teaching (required)

The Budget Council must prepare an assessment of candidate’s teaching role and performance:

- Statement is to include the typed names and the signatures of those members of the budget council responsible for preparing the statement
- Describe faculty member's principal areas of teaching
- Explanation of the evaluation procedures and measures used
- Discuss both student course/instructor and peer evaluations
- Discuss relevant evidence of merit or recognition for teaching excellence
- Reflect familiarity with the teaching portfolio (evaluate)
- Indicate faculty's willingness to teach courses having a strong student demand
- Describe participation on graduate committees
- Describe supervision of postdoctoral students, where applicable
- Describe and provide documentation of organized service learning instruction, where applicable
any special circumstances concerning the faculty member’s teaching performance should be considered and any
innovative contributions described
compare candidate’s teaching with other faculty in the department

Department: Peer evaluation report (report from peer evaluation team -- need not be budget council members):
Reports of all in-class observations while in rank are to be included in the dossier. Peer evaluations should be conducted no later than the spring semester preceding the Fall semester in which the candidate is to be reviewed. Identify faculty members conducting the peer evaluation of teaching and the number and title of the course observed and the date of observation. Observers are to sign their observation reports. The report is to be dated and explain methods of observation and inquiry. Review lecture style, organization, course content, student satisfaction, clarity of written materials prepared for classes, rigor and fairness of exams, availability and helpfulness of faculty member outside of class, and materials in teaching portfolio

Department: Chart - summarizing instructional activities for at least each of last three years. Include academic year, course number, title, enrollment, and overall instructor rating. Identify any team taught courses, or writing component courses. (The Summary of Recent Course-Instructor Survey Results will be provided by the Division of Instructional Innovation and Assessment to Deans and Department Chairs in early June and should be used for this requirement) (example attached)

Department: Course-Instructor Survey summary evaluations (candidates who have taught at other institutions may submit evaluations from those courses) originals of last three years (example attached). These are the individual CIS summary sheets from each course taught by the faculty member. They may be with the originals of the CIS. Please put a copy here as well.

Department: List of names of students co-supervised for theses and dissertations w/dates awarded (The Graduate School will prepare the Report of Students Supervised or Co-supervised for theses/dissertations and of supervising committee service. The report will include the name of the student supervised or on whose committee the faculty member served, last semester enrolled, degree, field, and year degree was awarded. List will be distributed in early September and it should be used to comply with this requirement, but should be reviewed for accuracy.)

Department: List of postdoctoral fellows supervised and the names of the institution that awarded their Ph.D. If no postdocs, provide a statement to this effect (e.g., Postdoctoral fellows supervised: None)

Candidate: Statement (needs to be in first person) (MAXIMUM: should be kept at 5 pages)

3. Research, Publications & Other Evidence of Scholarship/Creativity (as applicable)
If, consistent with the terms of employment, research/scholarly/creative contributions is selected as one of the areas of performance excellence for purposes of the promotion review by faculty in lecturer, clinical and adjunct titles, the Budget Council will provide an assessment:

assessments is to include the typed names and the signatures of those members of the budget council responsible for preparing the statement
describe how the review was conducted, including the standards used
evaluate the quantity and quality of research conducted
discuss the relative balance of individual vs. joint research against the norms of the discipline
discuss the significance of the candidate’s research and its contributions to the discipline
discuss research dollars generated
identify and comment on scholarly/creative contributions considered to be of major significance or outstanding quality
provide a brief statement of the basis for qualitative judgments in the area or discipline
indicate the quality of the outlets for a candidate's work (i.e., journals, art galleries.)
explain the norms of co-authorship and whether peer review was involved
explain the reasons if non-traditional outlets of research or scholarly/creative activity are to be counted favorably (e.g., textbooks, continuing education presentations, governmental or industrial service, etc.)

Candidate: Statement (needs to be in first person) include discussion of research results being careful for joint research to identify research results obtained by candidate vs. others (MAXIMUM--should be kept at 5 pages)
4. Academic Advising, Counseling and other Student Services (as applicable)
If, consistent with the terms of employment, academic advising, counseling, and other student service is selected as a performance area in support of the recommendation for promotion of lecturer, clinical and adjunct titles, the Budget Council will provide an assessment:

- Discuss research dollars generated
- Include totals (amount under candidate’s supervision and proposal total)
- Career total and total while rank should be listed
- List of the five most significant works chosen to be sent to central admin (five most significant works while in their current rank) These publications must be in accepted or published status.

Candidate:
- Statement (needs to be in first person) describing academic advising responsibilities at both the undergraduate and graduate levels during at least the last three years of service.

5. Administrative and Professional Service (as applicable)
If administrative and professional service is an area selected in support of the promotion recommendation of lecturer, clinical or adjunct faculty the Budget Council will provide an assessment:

- Assessment is to include the typed names and the signatures of those members of the budget council responsible for preparing the statement
- Describe and assess academic advising responsibilities at both the undergrad and grad levels during at least the last three years of service
- Describe other activities in support of the instructional process
- Consider how candidate assisted in advising undergrad, graduate, and postdoc students
- Especially noteworthy and deserves particular mention if service as Undergrad Advisor or Grad Advisor
- Mention other types of advising
  - 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 and study abroad
  - Advising student organizations
  - Recruitment and retention activities

Candidate:
- Statement (needs to be in first person) describing administrative and committee service as well as academic and professionally related public service contribution with focus on last three years

6. Honors and other Evidence of Merit or Recognition (as applicable)
Where this area is selected in support of a lecturer, clinical or adjunct promotion recommendation, the Budget Council will provide an assessment:

- Assessment is to include the typed names and the signatures of those members of the budget council responsible for preparing the statement
- If applicable, describe success in seeking and obtaining external funding, the sources of that funding, and the relative distribution of funding among those sources (note that dollars are not discussed here; actual research dollars and work are discussed in section 3)
- Describe the relevant evidence of exceptional academic or professional merit:
  - Contracts and grants of an honorific nature
  - Medals
  - Fellowships
  - Invitations to speak (at other universities, at professional society meetings, and in other venues)
2.  Other Honors

Candidate:

Statement (needs to be in first person) describing honors and other evidence of merit/recognition and, as applicable, success in seeking and obtaining external funding, the sources of that funding, and the relative distribution of funding among those sources. Note that research dollars are not discussed here; actual research dollars and work are discussed in section 3)

7. Letters of Reference/Recommendation/Evaluation (required)

Generating the List of Referees:

minimum of four (4) reference letters is required. All four (4) letters may come from internal reviewers unless research/scholarly/creative contributions are targeted in support of the recommendation in addition to teaching excellence, in which case two (2) of the four (4) letters must be solicited from external reviewers. Concentrate on colleagues at peer institutions and industry as appropriate.

evaluate the research/creative contributions and other accomplishments summarize candidate's professional standing

responsibility for developing a list of appropriate outside reviewers rests with the department chair/budget council. The candidate shall provide the chair/budget council with a list of individuals to be asked to provide peer review letters; and the chair/budget council shall also develop a list of outside reviewers whom they deem appropriate. In developing the list of external evaluators, both the candidate and the department are to avoid conflicts of interest (e.g., dissertation chairs, postdoctoral mentors, co-authors, collaborators) and seek out credible reviewers knowledgeable about the scholarly expectations of a research intensive university.

Although all contributions and accomplishments should be evaluated where applicable, special emphasis should be given to teaching performance and the other principal service area cited in support of the recommendation. About ½ of the reviewers are to be chosen from candidate’s preference list, others are to be arm’s-length evaluations selected by Dept. Chair/Budget Council reviewers should be individuals with an understanding of the academic setting and the standards against which the area benchmarks itself

Dept Chair shall ask the candidate to review the list prior to department sending out solicitation letters to referees

Budget Council Statement:

identify everyone approached to be a referee and the professional/academic stature of the referees. If a requested review is refused, a very brief explanation for the reviewer’s unwillingness to evaluate the candidate should be included.

--At a minimum the BC statement should do the following: identify the institution (including the department) or other agency with which the reviewer is affiliated; give the rank or other title within the organization; describe the academic specialization(s); and provide any other relevant information about the evaluator that would assist those involved in the process who are not practitioners in the candidate’s field to identify the professional/academic stature of the external referee.

explain why they were selected as reviewers

identify reviewers chosen by the candidate and those chosen by the chair/budget council.

Department:

example of letters sent to referees

list of publications or other examples of scholarly/creative activities sent to referees, if applicable.

Department: Letters

letters from each referee received must be in the same order as the Budget Council Statement

signed PDF version of reference letters are acceptable, but must be accompanied by the cover email sent

additional letters received after the Budget Council votes on the promotion package will not be included in the promotion package (barring extraordinary extenuating circumstances).

Department: Referee Vitas

include referee's vitas, a short version (preferably no longer than one page,) in the same order as the letters. If they do not send them, resumes should be printed from the Web and used, and state that vita info provided by dept. If a voluminous CV is sent, replace with a short bio from the Web. (no need for a vita for reviewers not providing letter)
Supplemental Materials (not included in Dossier)

Department: Supplemental Materials (goes forward to UT Administration) (required)
________ originals of all student written course evaluations for the last 3 years. (2007-08 through 2009-10) (separate folder, clearly labeled, e.g. J.J. Smith-CIS Student Comments)

Candidate: Supplemental Materials (goes forward to UT Administration) (as applicable)
________ the five most significant works (publications) These publications must be in accepted or published status. (separate folder, clearly labeled, e.g. J.J. Smith-Publications)
________ may place additional publications in the supplement
________ additional and/or supplementary materials candidate believes are important

Candidate: Publications (held at Dean’s level) (as applicable)
________ Copies of ALL scholarly works produced while in the current rank
________ BE SURE THE WORKS MATCH THE LIST IN THE VITAE (titles and co-author order and page numbers should match vita)
________ publications should be placed in the same order that they appear on the vitae (this makes it easier for the person checking for completeness and accuracy at both the dept. and school levels)

Candidate: Teaching Portfolio (held at Dean's level) (required)
For each course taught (while in rank) there should be examples of some of the following:
________ syllabi
________ handouts
________ problem sets
________ other written materials developed for courses
________ computer-assisted instructional aids
________ examinations
________ copies of edited and graded term papers for course with substantive writing component