



The University of Texas at El Paso  
College of Health Sciences

**GUIDELINES for PROMOTION for NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS**

This document adheres to the UT System policies and incorporates the processes in the UTEP Handbook of Operating Procedures (HoOP) located at:

<https://www.utep.edu/hoop/index.html>

Faculty members should consult the HoOP for more information. This document recognizes the guidance provided by the UTEP Office of the Provost on Promotion for Non-Tenure Track available at:

<https://www.utep.edu/provost/faculty/tenure-and-promotion.html>

This document provides college-specific guidance on the timeline and process prior to the Provost-level review.

**Definition of “Promotion”:** “Promotion” is the process by which a faculty member is considered for advancement to the next highest job rank (e.g., Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor). The process starts with the submission of a *dossier* (i.e., promotion packet) by the faculty candidate including all required elements described herein. The dossier is intended as an opportunity for the faculty candidate to demonstrate both quantitatively and qualitatively how and why they have earned Promotion as judged by their peers and supervisors. The dossier is reviewed by the Department or Program, Department Chair (“Chair”) or Program Director (“Director”), College, Dean, and Provost. However, only faculty members at the rank equal to or above that being sought by the candidate can officially vote on a recommendation for or against promotion. The exception is that Chairs/Directors will perform reviews of their faculty candidates even when the Chairs/Directors do not have rank at or above the level of promotion being sought. For example, if a Chair is a Clinical Associate Professor and a faculty member in their department is applying for promotion to Clinical Professor, the Chair would still perform the Chair-level review. Each reviewer or committee will submit a written letter containing a recommendation in favor of or against promotion for the candidate; the committee letter must also include the documentation of the committee vote. That letter will become a permanent part of the portfolio that moves to the next successive review step.

The promotion process is considered *discretionary*, meaning that the faculty candidate may choose to put their dossier forward for promotion during any given year. However, Promotion will be considered for NTT faculty candidates who have held their current rank for a minimum of 5 years. Equivalent experience may be considered for candidates who have not held their current rank for the full 5 years; however, faculty are encouraged to consult with their Chairs/Directors and the Dean’s Office to discuss whether prior work experience would reasonably be considered equivalent.

Each reviewer or committee is given the candidate’s portfolio in advance and is asked to submit a written recommendation in favor of or against Promotion for the candidate. That recommendation will become a permanent part of the portfolio that moves to the next successive review step. The ultimate decision-making

authority for NTT promotions rests with the Dean, who approves the promotion. This document is devoted to providing guidelines for NTT faculty candidates during their promotion process. Throughout the document, the term “dossier” refers to the candidate’s initial submission of materials for consideration for promotion. The term “portfolio” refers to the cumulative set of materials, including the dossier itself, the letters containing votes and recommendations from each level of review, and any other supporting materials.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS

NTT faculty members who qualify and wish to be considered for promotion must notify their Chair/Director of their intent to apply by **April 1**. Candidates are encouraged to communicate their intention to go up for promotion and discuss the process with their Chair/Director prior to this April 1 deadline. Faculty candidates seeking promotion must submit their complete electronic dossier to their Chair/Director by **August 15** of the same year. All NTT faculty candidates for promotion should read and follow the HoOP guidelines and policies pertaining to “Promotion” (guidelines for “Tenure” are not applicable): <https://www.utep.edu/hoop/section-3/academic-policies-and-faculty-personnel-matter/index.html>.

No faculty member may vote for the candidate at more than one level of review. For example, the Chair/Director may not vote at the Departmental level of review and also make a recommendation at the Chair/Director level. Similarly, a faculty member may not vote at both the Departmental and College levels of review.

Throughout this document, references are made to the “Chair/Director” as the leader of the academic department/program in which the candidate holds their appointment. As noted above, the Chair/Director will evaluate the candidate in their supervisory role within the Department or Program. In situations where the Chair/Director is the candidate seeking promotion, the candidate will not be reviewed at the Chair level, and the portfolio will proceed to the next level of review. The primary consideration is that all candidates seeking promotion are afforded a process that is as close to the typical review process as possible, while allowing for flexibility when a candidate’s leadership role necessitates it.

**Departmental Committee Review and Recommendation:** Following the policies in the UTEP HoOP (Section 3, 4.4.9: Initial Appointment and Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Faculty), consideration of an individual for promotion as an NTT faculty candidate will be initiated by the individual faculty member in consultation with the Chair/Director. Promotion to the next highest rank requires (1) a minimum of 5 years of experience at the current rank or equivalent experience, (2) a demonstrated record of excellence in each major domain of responsibility, and (3) evidence of significant impact beyond the classroom, profession/discipline, university, and/or region. The candidate must provide documentation that demonstrates the quality and robustness of the impact in their dossier. Documentation related to promotion will include a statement by the candidate regarding accomplishments within each major domain of responsibility assigned and evidence of achievement.

A Departmental Committee will be composed of NTT and T/TT faculty members at or above the rank being sought by the faculty candidate. If there is not a sufficient number (3 or more) of faculty members eligible to vote, the Dean, in consultation with the Chair/Director, shall appoint additional voting members from related disciplines. Individual committee members must identify any potential personal conflicts of interest and notify the Chair/Director of the need for replacement with a suitable alternate member. The Chair of the committee will be selected by the committee.

The Departmental Committee shall review the candidate’s dossier. Recommendations of promotion are primarily based on the candidate’s performance in each of the domains of responsibility assigned. Factors to be considered shall include, but are not limited to, an evaluation of (a) teaching effectiveness; (b) research

efforts based on workload percentages assigned; and (c) quality of service to include the candidate's contributions to the Program, Department, College, University, Profession, and the Community. The committee shall also assess the candidate's potential for future outstanding contributions to teaching, research (if applicable based on workload), and ongoing professional contributions to the University, College, Department/Program, Profession, and Community in areas consistent with the faculty candidate's assigned workload distribution.

The Chair of the Departmental Committee will conduct a vote on the recommendation of the candidate for promotion. The departmental letter will be written collectively by the committee and addressed to the Chair/Director. The results of the vote will be recorded within the committee's letter, to indicate the number of votes for, votes against, and abstentions.

The candidate will be informed of the recommendation of the Departmental Committee. At this point in the evaluation process, the candidate's portfolio will contain the dossier, the Departmental Committee's letter, and any supporting materials. The Dean's Office will maintain these materials and will forward them to the Chair/Director for the next level of review.

**Department Chair/Program Director Review and Recommendation:** Upon receipt of the candidate's portfolio, the Chair/Director will complete an independent review of the materials. The Chair/Director will then write an independent letter, including their recommendation and providing evidence to support their recommendation. The letter will be included in the candidate's portfolio.

The candidate will be informed of the recommendation of the Chair/Director. At this point in the evaluation process, the candidate's portfolio will contain the dossier, the Departmental Committee's letter, the Chair's or Program Director's letter, and any supporting materials. The Dean's Office will maintain these materials and forward them to the College Committee for the next level of review.

**College Committee Review and Recommendation:** The Dean's Office shall appoint an appropriate College Committee and instruct the committee on its purpose and function. If the College does not have a sufficient number of faculty members at the appropriate rank (3 or more), the Dean's Office will invite faculty members from other Colleges in related disciplines to serve on the College Committee. Only faculty members at or above the rank being sought are eligible to vote on recommendations for promotion. Individual committee members must identify any potential personal conflicts of interest and notify the Dean's Office of the need for replacement with a suitable alternate member. The Chair of the committee will be selected by the committee.

The College Committee will review the candidate's portfolio. The Chair of the Committee will conduct a vote on the recommendation of the candidate for promotion. The College Committee shall collectively write a letter to the Dean for each candidate, evaluating the candidate's teaching, research, and service accomplishments based on the candidate's workload percentages assigned to each domain of responsibility. The results of the vote will be recorded within the committee's letter to indicate the number of votes for, votes against, and abstentions, and the number of committee members voting. Dissenting members of the committee may submit their own signed letters to the Dean, which will be added to the candidate's portfolio.

The candidate will be informed of the recommendation of the College Committee. At this point in the evaluation process, the candidate's portfolio will contain the dossier; the letters of the Departmental Committee, the Chair/Director, and the College Committee; any dissenting letters of the College Committee; and any supporting materials.

**Dean's Review and Recommendation:** The Dean will complete an independent review of all materials in the candidate's portfolio and compose an independent letter with approval/disapproval, including evidence to support the decision. The candidate will be informed of the Dean's decision. No later than January 15, the Dean's Office will forward the candidate's complete portfolio to the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who will review the approval/disapproval. At this point in the evaluation process, the

candidate’s portfolio will contain the dossier; the letters of the Departmental Committee, the Chair/Director, the College Committee (including any dissenting letters), and the Dean; and any supporting materials.

### PROMOTION DEADLINES

<b><i>Deadline</i></b>	<b><i>Item</i></b>	<b><i>Responsible Party</i></b>
<b>Apr 1</b>	Faculty member (“Candidate”) seeking NTT promotion notifies Chair/Director and Dean’s Office	Candidate
<b>Aug 15</b>	Candidate sends dossier as an indexed PDF to Chair/Director, copying Dean’s Office	Candidate
<b>Sept 1</b>	Dean’s Office sends dossier to Departmental Committee	Dean’s Office
<b>Sept 23</b>	Departmental Committee letter is due to Dean’s Office, who informs candidate of committee recommendation and forwards portfolio to Chair/Director	Departmental Committee, Dean’s Office
<b>Oct 15</b>	Chair/Director letter is due to Dean’s Office, who informs candidate of Chair/Director recommendation and forwards portfolio to College Committee	Chair/Director, Dean’s Office
<b>Nov 15</b>	College Committee letter is due to Dean’s Office, who informs candidate of committee recommendation; Dean begins evaluation of candidate’s portfolio	College Committee, Dean’s Office
<b>Jan 15</b>	Dean’s letter along with complete portfolio is due to the Provost’s Office	Dean, Provost’s Office

### THE PROMOTION DOSSIER

The candidate must first review the CHS Guidelines for Promotion for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members (this document) to understand the criteria required for achieving promotion. Promotion policies are defined in The Handbook of Operating Procedures (HoOP, 4.4.9) available at:

<https://www.utep.edu/hoop/section-3/academic-policies-and-faculty-personnel-matter/index.html>

It is important that each candidate for promotion prepare and present for evaluation a complete, well-organized, well-documented, and clear dossier to accurately reflect the record of the candidate.

The promotion dossier materials are to be **submitted electronically**. All materials are to be in an electronic format and combined into a single, indexed PDF file. Original documents not in electronic form are to be scanned with sufficient quality to be clearly viewed by the reviewers.

The dossier should be arranged and sectioned according to the Table of Contents, and sections should be clearly delineated. Imbedded links to associated sections/materials (bookmarks) should be included to facilitate easy navigation of the overall packet. The dossier should be organized and ordered as indicated below. However, this list should not be interpreted to exclude the incorporation of additional, important, supportive material.

*Note:* The dossier will be submitted by the candidate to the Chair/Director, copying the Dean's Office, by August 15. At any point between August 15 and January 1, new materials and accomplishments can be added to the portfolio by the candidate. Once the portfolio leaves the Dean's Office and advances to the Provost's Office, no additional material can be added.

To "add" additional materials to the portfolio, the candidate should develop a formal memo/letter, addressed to the current level of review (e.g., College of Health Sciences Promotion Committee, Dean, etc.), and list/describe additional major accomplishments. This formal memo/letter will be included within the portfolio following the materials of the previous level of review, creating a chronological record of the materials that have been added to the portfolio following the initial submission of the dossier.

## **1. GENERAL DOCUMENTS**

### **1.1. Updated Curriculum Vita**

### **1.2. Executive Summary (Maximum of 3 pages)**

A summary, no more than three pages in length, of the faculty member's teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The section on teaching should include a summary of student evaluations and peer observations of teaching. The candidate can expand upon the themes in this summary within the latter narrative sections of the dossier (Sections 2, 3, and 4).

### **1.3. Faculty member's Annual Performance Evaluations since initial appointment or since most recent promotion**

## **2. TEACHING ACTIVITIES**

### **2.1. Teaching Narrative**

This section may contain a statement specific to the candidate's teaching philosophy. The section is an introduction to the teaching section of the dossier and, as such, should place teaching activities (as detailed in the subsections below) in context. (3 page maximum)

### **2.2. Professional Information**

2.2.1. List of courses taught

2.2.2. List of new courses and/or major course revisions including conversions to online

- teaching or hybrid format and addition of service learning components
- 2.2.3. Teaching load information, including level and class size
- 2.2.4. Evidence of curriculum development, including sample syllabi and course materials
- 2.2.5. Demonstrated creativity in teaching; e.g. teaching awards, established new clinical site, developed new teaching-learning activity, media production such as videos, software, etc.
- 2.2.6. Professional development in teaching, including workshops and seminars presented and attended
- 2.2.7. Participation and accomplishment in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL)
- 2.2.8. Advising of undergraduate and graduate students
- 2.2.9. Other evidence (optional)

**2.3. Evidence of Teaching Quality**

- 2.3.1. Student evaluations and comments, tabulated and summarized (include actual student evaluations as an appendix)
- 2.3.2. Projects, Theses and Dissertations supervised
- 2.3.3. Honors and awards earned by supervised students
- 2.3.4. Career achievements of mentored students
- 2.3.5. Community and/or school-based projects guided and produced in connection with courses (service-learning experiences)
- 2.3.6. Copies of peer evaluations from UTEP faculty members who have observed classes or reviewed course materials
- 2.3.7. Honors or awards for teaching excellence
- 2.3.8. Extramural funds awarded for instructional, innovation, facilities, and student support
- 2.3.9. Other evidence (optional)

**3. RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES** (if the candidate has a research workload allocation)

**3.1. Research/Scholarship Narrative**

This section may contain a statement specific to the candidate’s line(s) of research and the impact of the research. The section is an introduction to the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities section of the dossier and, as such, should place the candidate’s research activity and impact (as detailed in the subsections below) in context. (3 page maximum)

**3.2. Evidence of Success in Research and Other Scholarly Activities**

- 3.2.1. List of articles in refereed scholarly journals (include a maximum of three most significant papers as an appendix)
  - 3.2.1.1 Submitted (under review)
  - 3.2.1.2 In-press
  - 3.2.1.3 Published
- 3.2.2. List of abstracts in refereed scholarly journals or conference proceedings
  - 3.1.2.1. Submitted (under review)
  - 3.1.2.2. In-press
  - 3.1.2.3. Published
- 3.2.3. List of abstracts or papers presented at scholarly meetings that are not published in refereed scholarly journals
  - 3.1.3.1. Submitted (under review)
  - 3.1.3.2. Presented

- 3.2.4. List of published books, book chapters, monographs, etc. (include ISBN, ISSN)
- 3.2.5. List of non-referred articles written for the public or professional audience
- 3.2.6. Citation data of articles in refereed scholarly journals
- 3.2.7. Impact factors of refereed journals where published
- 3.2.8. Other evidence (optional)

**3.3. Evidence of Success in Securing Intramural Funding**

- 3.3.1. Proposals funded
- 3.3.2. Proposals pending
- 3.3.3. Proposals submitted (not awarded)
- 3.3.4. Other evidence (optional)

**3.4. Evidence of Success in Securing Extramural Funding**

- 3.4.1. Proposals funded
- 3.4.2. Proposals pending
- 3.4.3. Proposals submitted (not awarded)
- 3.4.4. Other evidence (optional)

**3.5. Evidence of Involving Students in Research**

- 3.5.1. Number of students supported by extramural/intramural funding
- 3.5.2. Articles co-authored with students
- 3.5.3. Presentations by students involved in research at national and international conferences
- 3.5.4. Other evidence (optional)

**4. SERVICE ACTIVITIES**

**4.1. Service Narrative**

This section should contain a statement specific to the candidate's service. The statement may include a philosophy and/or the ways in which service at each level is integrated with the candidate's research and teaching. The section is an introduction to the Service Activities section of the dossier and, as such, should place the candidate's service activities (as detailed in the subsections below) in context, highlighting the impact of the activities. (3 page maximum)

**4.2. Evidence of Service to the University**

- 4.2.1. Service on departmental, college, or university committees at UTEP
- 4.2.2. Supervision of student organizations at UTEP
- 4.2.3. Service in an administrative role at UTEP
- 4.2.4. Other evidence (optional)

**4.3. Evidence of Service to Community, Regional, National, or International Organizations**

(Include the following sections as applicable.)

- 4.3.1. Service on professional and community boards
- 4.3.2. Membership and leadership in professional and technical societies
- 4.3.3. Service to the profession, including editorships, editorial boards, participation in panel reviews, and regular and ad-hoc reviewer for journals
- 4.3.4. Consulting work or clinical practice
- 4.3.5. Program review for state/national accreditation bodies
- 4.3.6. Conference organization and/or hosting

- 4.3.7. Activities involving community partners, service learning, or collaborative projects
- 4.3.8. Lectures to community and professional audiences and organizations
- 4.3.9. Other evidence (optional)

**BOYER MODEL OF SCHOLARSHIP**

Scholarship of:	Purpose	Measures of Performance
Teaching	Study teaching models and practices to achieve optimal student learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advancing learning theory through classroom research</li> <li>• Developing and validating instructional materials</li> <li>• Mentoring graduate students</li> <li>• Designing and implementing course-, program-, and/or college-level assessment system</li> </ul>
Discovery	Create/discover new knowledge through traditional research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publishing in refereed forums</li> <li>• Producing creative work within established field</li> <li>• Creating infrastructure for future studies (establishing a distinct line of study, grant funding, etc.)</li> </ul>
Integration	Interpret and incorporate the use of evidence-based knowledge across disciplines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparing/publishing a comprehensive literature review</li> <li>• Authoring a textbook for use in multiple disciplines</li> <li>• Collaborative course design and/or deliver (within and/or across disciplines)</li> </ul>
Application	Contribute/expand society's and/or profession's ability to address problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consulting services to industry or government</li> <li>• Assuming leadership positions for professional organizations</li> <li>• Fostering the professional growth of students through mentoring/advising</li> </ul>

Adapted from: Marta Nibert. 2.5.1 Boyer's Model of Scholarship. In Faculty Guidebook: A Comprehensive Tool for Improving Faculty Performance. Eds: Beyerlein, Holmes, Apple. Plainfield, IL, Pacific Crest; 2007.