

1.2 Promotion: Teaching track (non-tenure) Faculty (Adopted by the LBJ School Budget Council, 14 November, 2005; revised 9 October 2006)

Like all units of The University of Texas at Austin (UT/A), the LBJ School of Public Affairs abides by policies and procedures established by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost regarding the review and promotion of non-tenure track teaching faculty. For example, the LBJ School accepts and incorporates as its policy three relevant UT/A documents, which are attached to this statement of proposed policy.

- Draft report of the President’s Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenure Track Teaching Faculty dated October 16, 2002, as found on the website of the UT/A Faculty Council;
- A memorandum to Deans and Department Chairs from President Larry Faulkner, on “Academic Promotions of Non-Tenure Track Faculty” dated March 28, 2005, as available from the Office of the Provost; and
- General Guidelines for Preparation of Supporting Materials and Management of Non-Tenure Track Promotion Files dated Fall 2005, as available from the Office of the Provost.

To provide additional guidance to candidates for promotion and to members of its Budget Council on promotion issues, the LBJ School Budget Council has established the internal policies listed below.

Requests for consideration for promotion must be communicated to the Chair of the Budget Council by **February 1**. If a request is not submitted on a timely basis, the Budget Council will defer further consideration of the case until the next calendar year. In February the Budget Council Chair will appoint a subcommittee to consider the candidate’s case.

Complete draft of promotion file. Each candidate for promotion is required to submit a complete draft of his promotion file by **April 15** of the calendar year of consideration. The candidate alone is responsible for developing the substance of the dossier. The dossier should not only list, but also document as fully as possible, the candidate’s achievements over the course of time in the areas of teaching and research or service. The applicant, following the required UT/A format with the necessary UT/A content for review by the Budget Council, must prepare a draft of the file. This timing is necessary to allow the Budget Council subcommittee to thoroughly review the file, undertake in-class observation, and request external review of the file. If a complete draft has not been submitted by 15 April, the Budget Council will defer further consideration of the case until the next calendar year. The Budget Council Chair will provide suggestions for revising the draft submitted on April 15.

Final promotion file. All candidates are required to submit a final promotion file by 1 August. The final promotion file must be prepared by the applicant following the required

format with the necessary content to be reviewed by the Budget Council. This gives LBJ administrative staff the time they need to ensure the file adheres to the Provost's requirements. It also gives Budget Council members the time they need to review the file thoroughly. If a final file has not been submitted by this time, the Budget Council will defer further consideration of the case until the next calendar year. The Budget Council chair must attest that the final file has been submitted on a timely basis before the review can proceed.

Subcommittee recommendation. In late August the subcommittee will report to the Budget Council with a recommendation. Each of the subcommittee members must attest to the subcommittee's recommendation or submit an independent opinion.

Budget Council recommendation. In September the Budget Council will hold a meeting to hear the report of the subcommittee and to discuss the case. It will issue a recommendation to the Dean prior to 30 September.

Criteria for Promotion

UT/A has established criteria for promotion of non-tenure track faculty. Exceptional teaching performance is expected and a well-documented record of teaching excellence is required. The LBJ School expects non-tenure track faculty **to achieve a record of teaching excellence that exceeds the average within the LBJ School and exceeds the standards required for a tenure-track faculty member to be recommended for promotion.** There are multiple sources of evidence that candidates can use to demonstrate teaching performance, including:

- Teaching excellence awards;
- The candidate's teaching statement;
- Numerical scores from ex-post student course evaluations;
- Comments made by students in ex-post course evaluations;
- In-class observation by colleagues;
- Written evidence from the required teaching portfolio;
- External evaluations of teaching by external reviewers, if available;
- Outcome or performance measures; for example, in the case of a policy research project, one outcome measure would be a published report or other written deliverables;
- Comments made on recommendations solicited from former students who have graduated;
- Special attributes of courses taught and their contribution to the LBJ School curriculum; and
- Other evidence of excellence.

UT/A requires a record of accomplishment in at least one of the other areas of service consistent with the terms of employment and documented in appropriate ways. The candidate will declare the second area at the time the draft dossier is submitted on April 15. The possible areas include:

- (a) Publications and other evidence of scholarship/creativity;
- (b) Service to the university and to the nation, state and community; or
- (c) Academic advising, counseling and other student services.

Note that “honors and other evidence of merit or recognition” is not a category to be considered as a basis for promotion, even though it is required in a dossier.

a. Publications and other evidence of scholarship/creativity

The candidate will prepare a statement for the dossier summarizing the corpus of the scholarship and the critical contributions made to the literature. The candidate should also discuss any recognition that his work has received. The dossier should include:

- complete publications record with:
 - ✓ publications and other evidence of scholarship/creativity listed according to the kind of entry, e.g., books, reports, chapters, articles, and other materials;
 - ✓ the names of the co-authors listed in the order in which they appear in the publication;
 - ✓ clear designation of the candidate’s role if it is not author (e.g., editor, compiler, translator, or some other role);
 - ✓ works that are submitted, accepted, forthcoming, in press, clearly labeled;
 - ✓ beginning and ending page numbers for articles and total number of pages for books
- research contracts/grants and proposals submitted with:
 - ✓ funding sources
 - ✓ 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, pending funding)

Co-authored Works and Works Forthcoming. For co-authored works, candidates need to submit a separate document that indicates who the co-authors are (e.g., current/former student, faculty colleague at UT Austin or another institution). For co-authored works involving faculty colleagues or peers, the candidate should indicate the relative division of labor between the candidate and any co-authors. For works that are forthcoming, letters of acceptance from editors are to be submitted with the file. Reviews, where available, are to be included.

The scholarly contributions of the candidate will be judged by the Budget Council first in terms of the overall quality and quantity of the work produced. The summary should identify and comment on those items considered to be of major significance or outstanding quality and provide a brief statement of the basis for qualitative judgments in

the area or discipline. The assessment is to include the typed names and signatures of the Budget Council members responsible for preparing the statement.

The subcommittee needs to describe how it conducted its review, the standards used and the norms of the field. It should indicate, for example, the quality of the outlets for a candidate's work (i.e., journals, presses, art galleries, etc.) and explain the norms of co-authorship in the area. If non-traditional outlets for research or scholarly/creative activity are to be counted favorably (e.g., textbooks, continuing education presentations, governmental or industrial service, clinical practice, etc.), the report should explain the reasons for doing so. For works that have been accepted or are forthcoming, a letter from the editor or publishing house must be included, and the anticipated publication date noted.

The internal and external review may concentrate on a smaller set of publications that are considered to be the most significant. The candidate is responsible for making the selection of the five most significant works, and only these five need accompany the dossier as far as the central administration.

b. Service to the university and to the nation, state and community

The quality of service contributions to the University, the community, the state and the nation will be judged along three dimensions. Candidates are expected to demonstrate high levels of achievement in two of the following three dimensions of public service. Letters attesting to these contributions can be requested by the candidate and included in the dossier.

Professionally related public service.

Contributions to public service include major consulting work, testifying in front of government, writing for the general public in newspapers and magazines, speaking at conferences and other professional activities that signal that the faculty member has remained actively engaged with the world of practice.

Administrative and committee service.

Positions of leadership, such as chairing a School or University committee, should be noted in particular. Membership on committees, while important, is not per se evidence of exceptional service. The Budget Council understands the "General Guidelines" to the effect that there are two tests of service:

Leadership, as a "process" variable, defined by what tasks were part of the service; and

Deliverables of the service, as an "outcome" variable, defined by the nature of what is accomplished through the service.

Academic service.

Outstanding service in scholarly organizations, such as an editorship of a highly respected refereed journal or an elected office in a significant scholarly organization.

c. Student Services

The candidate may document and demonstrate a high level of achievement in the area of student advising and counseling. In assessing this contribution, factors to be considered include the number of students assisted, the execution of special efforts and initiatives in the area of student services, and the significance and value of the work for the overall functioning of the School. Evidence can include contributions to student learning through such activities as arranging for outside speakers or panel discussions.

Voting procedures

Absentee voting. The Budget Council believes that promotion decisions are best made after a thorough discussion of the case. Issues and arguments often surface in discussion that were not apparent from examination of the promotion file. This puts Budget Council members who are unable to participate in the discussion at a disadvantage. Nevertheless, we recognize that some members may believe they have sufficient information to make an informed decision, even though they are unable to attend the meeting. Thus, absentee voting is allowed, so long as no Budget Council member who is present at the meeting objects prior to the vote. Absentee votes must be delivered in writing (including via email) to the Budget Council Chair before the meeting begins. They are considered confidential and the Chair will not divulge them.

Secret ballot. All votes in promotion cases will be by secret ballot.

Requirements for positive recommendation. In all cases of promotion of non-tenure track faculty, a majority vote of eligible Budget Council members will be sufficient to merit a positive recommendation.

Appendix: Schedule for Non-Tenure Track Promotion

<u>Date</u>	<u>Event</u>
February 1	Declaration of candidacy
February	Budget Council assesses the prima facie case for promotion
March 31	Budget Council appoints subcommittee
April	Subcommittee meets with candidate, chooses external reviewers
April 15	Draft of file submitted to subcommittee
	Chair of Budget Council confirms that the file is complete
	If research is chosen, materials mailed to reviewers

August 1	Final promotion file submitted for Budget Council review External reviews completed
September 1	Candidate submits a complete dossier for Budget Council review to the Dean's Office, witnessed by chair of Budget Council
September	One week before Budget Council review of the case, the subcommittee chair will provide a copy of the external review letters to the Dean's Office, to be made available to the Budget Council
September September 30	Subcommittee reports to Budget Council for deliberations and vote Budget Council report submitted to Dean

11/07/06