THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
COCKRELL SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

DOSSIER-PROMOTION PACKET-TABBED SECTIONS CHECKLIST

RESEARCH PROFESSOR TITLE SERIES

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.
   - Research Professor title series requires scholarly credentials comparable to those of tenured or tenure-track faculty at the same academic rank.
   - 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 of all such candidates for promotion. In addition, research professors are expected to contribute actively in other ways to the academic enterprise and to document their other service contributions in appropriate ways.
   - Although all contributions and accomplishments of non-tenure track candidates should be evaluated where applicable, special emphasis is to be given to research activity and other academic service for faculty in these research professor titles.
   - 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, as applicable to the specific research professor 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 Research Professor, the candidate must limit their statements to their work while in the rank of Associate Research Professor. Any scholarly materials accepted or published after November 1 of the year in which a promotion case is submitted should count toward the next promotion decision. This is to eliminate the “dead zone” issue between submission of the promotion package and the official promotion date to Associate Research Professor, if applicable.

8. For candidates being considered for promotion to Research Associate Professor, the candidate’s statements and the Budget Council members’ assessments should indicate whether the candidate has achieved a national reputation. For candidates being considered for promotion to Research Professor, the candidate’s statements and the Budget Council members’ assessments should indicate whether the candidate has achieved an international reputation.

9. 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 research professors 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:

- _____ teaching, both undergraduate and graduate, as applicable
- _____ research, creative, and other scholarly activities, required
- _____ advising, counseling and other student service, required
- _____ administrative and committee service, public service of an academic or professional nature to the nation, state and local community, required
- _____ 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, required

Director Statement

_____ the Director of the bureau, academic/research center, laboratory or institute where the faculty member is appointed must provide an assessment of the candidate’s research performance and other academic and professional contributions. Statement is to include the typed name and the signature of the director. This statement is to follow the dean’s and chair’s statement. It is to be provided to the Department Chair for consideration by the Budget Council in its deliberations.

Joint Appointment/Courtesy Appointment Statements

_____ 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

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

If a faculty member in a research professor title has had a teaching role, the Budget Council must prepare an assessment-assessment of teaching performance to include:

- 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.

report is to be dated

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 (2007-08 through 2009-10) (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 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 may 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

Required Budget Council Assessment:

assessment is to include the typed names and the signatures of those members of the budget council responsible for preparing the statement

identify which faculty members reviewed the candidate's research

describe how the review was conducted, including the standards used

evaluate the quality and quantity 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 which faculty members reviewed the candidate’s publications and other scholarly work

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.)

compare candidates research, publications, scholarship to other faculty in department at the equivalent tenure/tenure-track level
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)

list of research projects while in rank, designation of individual or joint supervision, total funding, and funding under supervision of candidate

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 (candidates for promotion to research professor should select the five most significant works while in their current rank) These publications must be in accepted or published status.

4. Academic Advising, Counseling and other Student Services

Required Budget Council Assessment:

typing 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

advising student organizations

recruitment and retention activities

describe the placement of candidate’s Ph.D. students

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.

List placement of Ph.D. students

5. Service to the University and to the Nation, State and Community

Required Budget Council Assessment:

typing names and the signatures of those members of the budget council responsible for preparing the statement

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:

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

describe the nature of activities cited in support of the recommendation and assess the quality of the service

candidate’s service with other faculty in the department

6. Honors and other Evidence of Merit or Recognition, Including Contracts & Grants

Required Budget Council Assessment:

typing names and the signatures of those members of the budget council responsible for preparing the statement

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)
election to office in scholarly or professional organizations
other honors
indicate the relative prestige of those honors
distinguish between awards made on the basis of promise/basis of accomplishment
compare candidate’s honors with other faculty in the department

Candidate:
Statement (needs to be in first person) describing 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

Generating the List of Referees:
minimum of four (4) reference letters is required. At least three (3) 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.
The emphasis of the review is on research performance and the candidate’s overall academic-related service contributions.
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/research 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 external 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

Department: Letters
letters received from each referee 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
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)

______ If assigned duties include teaching, originals of all course evaluations (separate folder) 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)

______ the five most significant works (publications) (candidates for promotion to research professor should select the five most significant works while in their current rank). 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)

______ 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: If assigned duties include teaching, then Teaching Portfolio (held at Dean's level)

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