

1.1 Promotion Rules for Tenure Track Faculty

Adopted on 18, April 2011.

Introduction

The Budget Council (BC) of the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs (LBJ School) abides by all policies and procedures established by The University of Texas at Austin (UT Austin), as expressed in the annual revisions of those policies by the Office of the Provost and the Office of the President. The reason for this set of BC rules is to provide more explicit guidelines for promotion consideration along a number of dimensions. These include: (a) to whom the rules apply; (b) an annual schedule for promotion consideration; (c) the evaluation of teaching; (d) the evaluation of research; (e) the evaluation of service; (f) guidance for the BC subcommittee; and (g) BC voting procedures. These topics are considered below.

The BC recognizes that any recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure is advice furnished to the Dean as part of the UT Austin promotion process. Any BC recommendation or report provides independent advice to the UT Austin President's Executive Committee (the Tower) as a supplement to the Dean's recommendation. A Dean's recommendation is not limited in any way by the BC vote. A Dean may support promotion even if there is a majority of BC votes (or even unanimity) against promotion. A Dean may oppose promotion even if there are two-thirds of the BC votes (or even unanimity) for promotion.

To whom do these rules apply?

These rules apply to any tenure track faculty member who wishes to be promoted to Associate Professor or Professor within the LBJ School or to any candidate without tenure who wishes to be hired by the LBJ School with tenure.

To assure sufficient time to manage the external referee process, an Assistant Professor due to be considered for promotion according to the standard UT Austin schedule (i.e., up or out) would indicate her/his intent to the BC Chair in December of her/his fifth year in the probationary period. The external reference process would be initiated during the Spring of the fifth probationary year. Under such a schedule, any promotion/tenure decision would be made in the Fall semester of the sixth probationary year.

A formal annual schedule is listed below. The BC will provide its final report on the promotion case to the Dean prior to the end of September.

Schedule for Tenure Track Promotion

Date	Activity
Fall	BC chair informs each Assistant Professor of her/his years in service within the probationary period
December 1	Identification of candidacy for promotion
January 15	BC Chair designates a subcommittee for prima facie case* The candidate furnishes a draft promotion file to the Office of the Dean including: all publications; all draft statements by the candidate; and all teaching records (this hold for all candidates)
January	BC subcommittee evaluates promotion prima facie case*
February	BC considers prima facie case; if approved BC Chair appoints a promotion subcommittee* The BC Chair appoints a BC review subcommittee during February
March 15	Subcommittee invites external reviews (first round) Candidate submits a complete draft promotion file to Office of the Dean with the contents and in the format requested by the Tower (can be revised later)
May 10	Budget Council informs the Tower of a promotion case that is under review, per the President's letter on the tenure track promotion process (date may vary). Subcommittee invites external reviews (second round, if necessary)
August 1	Candidate submits final, revised promotion file to Office of the Dean
August 15	External reviews completed
September 10	BC subcommittee provides full promotion file to BC BC subcommittee presents report to BC
September 20	BC promotion meetings occur after this date
September 30	BC recommendation submitted to Dean

* This step is taken only in the case of early promotion. There is no prima facie evaluation for a promotion case that follows the regular promotion schedule. This schedule and these rules do not apply to non tenure-track promotions; those rules are separate and beyond the scope of this document.

Each fall the BC chair will inform each Assistant Professor where she/he stands with respect to the probationary tenure clock and of the academic year when she/he would be expected to be considered for tenure. The rules for counting of time toward the probationary period for consideration for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor are complex and beyond the scope of this document. An Assistant Professor is advised to consult the guidance documents from the Office of the Provost, the Office of the President, and the UT Austin Handbook of Operating and Procedures (HOP).

Any Assistant Professor who wishes to be considered for promotion in the sixth year of the probationary period (with notice to the BC in the fifth year) must be considered in that year; the BC has no discretion in such a case. An Assistant Professor who wishes to be considered prior to the up-or-out sixth year will follow the prima facie process discussed below. The BC has the discretion to recommend or to not recommend that a colleague to be considered for early promotion. An Assistant Professor who wishes to be promoted early would follow the schedule listed above in the year she/he wishes to be considered.

The BC and the Dean are expected to make independent recommendations regarding any case of promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure. The Dean's position can differ from the advice of the BC.

An Assistant Professor from another university who wishes to be hired as an Associate Professor with tenure at the LBJ School would work through an abbreviated process that ends with the BC vote and the Dean's recommendation to be hired with tenure. The schedule would be as short as possible, consistent with the end in view. The BC has the right and responsibility to recommend or not recommend that a colleague be hired at a rank of Associate Professor with tenure.

In terms of events in the year of promotion consideration, an Associate Professor who wishes to be promoted to Full Professor would follow the formal schedule listed above in the year that she/he wishes to be considered. The rules regarding when an Associate Professor can be considered for promotion are complex and beyond the scope of this document. An Associate Professor is advised to consult the guidance documents from the Office of the Provost, the Office of the President and the UT Austin Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP).

The Tower perceives any request for promotion from Associate to Full Professor before six years in the Associate Professor grade have elapsed as an "early promotion." A request for promotion from Associate Professor after 6, 7 or 8 years in grade is a "timely" request, but one that is discretionary: the BC can recommend for or against a promotion to proceed. In any case where the BC has the discretion to recommend or not recommend that a colleague be considered for promotion, it will proceed through its prima facie process, as discussed below.

The BC and the Dean are expected to make independent recommendations regarding any case of promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. The Dean’s position can differ from the advice of the BC.

Any Associate Professor who wishes to be considered for promotion in the Fall of her/his tenth year in rank may invoke a right of consideration. The promotion process would begin in the winter/spring of the ninth year in grade. The BC has no discretion in such a case. Once invoked, the case will be considered at all levels of the administration, including the President. If a colleague does not invoke the right of consideration in the winter/spring of the ninth year, she/he may do so in any subsequent year.

If unsuccessful, an Associate Professor may again exercise a “right” to consideration at the end of any subsequent five years of service.

The process for an Associate Professor is summarized in the table below:

Years in Grade	Status	Discretionary
1 to 5	Early	Discretionary
6 – 8	Regular	Discretionary
9 or any later year	Regular	Not discretionary
Every 5 years	Reconsideration	Not Discretionary
Other years	Reconsideration	Discretionary

If a person ‘stops the tenure clock’ for any reason, the timing of the tenure process will change to reflect that deferral. A person who ‘steps off’ the tenure clock in any portion of any year for any reason will be treated as if they were not on the tenure clock for that year. The BC supports with enthusiasm any deferral of the tenure clock that UT Austin endorses as a matter of principle and practice, such as the birth of a child or responding to a serious illness.

The BC does not encourage routine faculty “leaves” to stop the tenure clock, if the purpose of the leave is solely for the purpose of obtaining an additional year prior to tenure consideration to complete publications. The BC’s expectations for faculty productivity and excellence to rise with each year beyond year 6 if the delay is tied only to faculty member’s preference for more time to complete publications.

The candidate who has taken an extension of the time beyond the usual six years does not need to document a reason in the promotion file separate from a copy of any requests for leave. The reason for a stop of the tenure clock should be documented in the leave request. The reason will either reflect a prior-approved extension, which by definition is for personal circumstances, or a prior-approved leave without pay, which can be either personal or due to an external research fellowship or other award. The BC subcommittee does not need to report the

reason why the candidate stopped the tenure clock, as the reason will be identified in the leave request within the tenure file.

In any case of early promotion, if a candidate for promotion is unable to submit adequate materials for review by the prima facie subcommittee by early January or a draft promotion file by March 15 or the final promotion file by August 15, the BC Chair may call a BC meeting to terminate the consideration of promotion for the year. A decision cannot be rendered on a case with incomplete information.

The lower limit for materials to be submitted to the Office of the Dean by January 15 will be one hard copy of all publications; one set of all available teaching evaluations; a complete resume, and the set of three required personal statements on teaching, research, and service. By the March 15 deadline the candidate must add an early draft of all the files for the tenure review case, collected in the order required by the Office of the Provost and the Office of the President. By the August 1 deadline the tenure file should be complete and organized in proper order, ready to be reviewed by the BC, the Dean, and the Tower.

The Prima Facie Process

In any case of a discretionary decision as to whether the BC should recommend that a person should be considered for promotion, the LBJ School BC Chair will appoint a minimum of two persons to a prima facie subcommittee to make a recommendation to the BC. The prima facie subcommittee should not include the designated mentor for the person and should not include any faculty member who co-authors papers or co-manages grants with the candidate, so there is no appearance of creating a subcommittee of advocates.

The prima facie subcommittee will be expected to meet with the candidate and with the mentor. It is important for all concerned that the observations of the mentor be reflected in the report to the BC and the reviews and preferences of the candidate be known with clarity. The BC does not want to be in a position where it cannot act because there is insufficient information upon which to make a determination.

The prima facie subcommittee will review the draft promotion file developed by the candidate and consult with the mentor and the candidate. The subcommittee will make a recommendation. The reason for this step in the process is that the BC does not want to be put in a position of bringing forward a discretionary promotion file for a person who is not likely to be promoted. The BC does not want to move forward in a case when it is in the best interest of the faculty member her/himself for the promotion consideration to be deferred to a later year without prejudice.

A majority vote by the BC in the prima facie stage is sufficient for a candidate to move forward to the promotion stage, as discussed below. In keeping with BC practice, the BC Chair will inform the candidate of the “yes/no” result, but provide no numerical results or reveal who has supported or who has opposed promotion. The BC Chair should provide guidance in response to any candidate questions, but

should not attempt to evaluate the likelihood of promotion, as there is no basis for such a statement after a prima facie recommendation.

The Promotion Subcommittee Process

For any tenure or promotion case the BC Chair will appoint a minimum of three persons to a promotion subcommittee to review the tenure file, obtain external peer assessments, and recommend to the BC for or against promotion of the candidate.

One member of the subcommittee shall be selected by the candidate her/himself. The BC Chair should not be able to influence the candidate's choice of subcommittee member, so that there is no perceived unfairness in the composition of the subcommittee.

The BC Chair should assure that at least one member of the subcommittee is sufficiently knowledgeable so as to be able to evaluate the research of the candidate independently of any peer reviewers. While there may be some differences of opinion as whether a colleague is or is not able to review research independently, that is a decision that the BC leaves to the discretion of the BC Chair. The BC does not want to be put in the position that anyone could argue that the members of the subcommittee are not able to evaluate the candidate's research independently of the external peer reviewers.

UT Austin colleagues from outside of the LBJ School have served on LBJ School promotion subcommittees. Peer colleagues from other units bring with their service the additional element of not being involved in internal issues within the LBJ School and enhance the credibility of an internal LBJ School process that is open to advice from colleagues from other units with special expertise in the areas of the promotion candidate's focus.

As with the prima facie subcommittee, the BC Chair should construct the promotion and tenure subcommittee so there is no appearance of creating a subcommittee of advocates. Given that the candidate has free choice of one BC subcommittee member, the BC Chair should avoid appointing to the subcommittee either the candidate's mentor or a person who co-authors papers or co-manages grants. If the subcommittee is composed solely of advocates for the candidate then the BC process will be undermined.

To further assure a balanced review, the BC Chair should appoint at least one member of the subcommittee who is not directly in the area of expertise of the candidate, to assure the broader consideration of LBJ School and UT Austin institutional needs and expectations.

The promotion subcommittee shall prepare a draft written report that addresses all of the elements expected in tenure or promotion decision in a timely manner so that BC members can read the draft at least ten days prior to any tenure or promotion vote.

Voting Procedures

Any decision to promote a tenure-track colleague from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor or from Associate Professor to Full Professor will require both a quorum and a two-thirds majority vote, as defined below. Any decision to hire a candidate from outside the LBJ School into a tenured position will meet the same standards of quorum and two-thirds majority for a recommendation for tenure.

Prior to any meeting where a promotion or tenure vote is possible, the BC Chair will indicate who is eligible to vote as a BC member and identify the minimum number for a BC quorum.

When quorums of BC members meet regarding a hiring or promotion decision, a recommendation for promotion to tenure or hiring with tenure requires a two-thirds majority vote of the BC members present. Only "yes" votes (for promotion or hiring with tenure) count towards the two-thirds majority. Any other vote – a "no" vote, or a vote to abstain, or a failure to vote-counts against the two-thirds majority.

The BC does not allow in-absentia voting, with one exception. If a member of the BC subcommittee that made the recommendation to the BC is unable to participate in the meeting, that person's vote will be counted as if she/he were present. The rationale for this exception is that any BC subcommittee members will have studied the file in detail and their effort should be reflected in a vote, even if due to reasons of schedule they are unable to attend the BC meeting. Any in-absentia vote must be provided in writing to the BC Chair and to the Dean's office staff person who assists in BC business prior to the BC meeting. The BC Chair will announce at the BC meeting the names of any persons who have submitted in-absentia ballots, but not their votes. The names of each person who submits a ballot will be reported to the Tower. The list will not distinguish among votes at a meeting or any in-absentia votes. In order to assure confidentiality, the BC does not want to create or store electronic records of any individual's absentee ballot. All absentee ballots will be destroyed after the votes are tabulated.

The persons eligible to vote are those persons who are BC members and who are in the appropriate rank. Full and Associate Professors with tenure can vote on tenure decisions. Only Full Professors with tenure may vote on a case of promotion from Associate to Full Professor. The BC Chair will circulate a list of eligible voters for any BC matter at least one week in advance of the promotion meeting, so that colleagues can confirm who is eligible to vote and the required number for a majority quorum.

The BC wants to assure that as many members as possible attend and vote on any tenure or promotion case. The date of any promotion meeting usually should be set months in advance, but certainly at least a month in advance.

Contents and Order of the Promotion File

The contents and order of the promotion file will follow the requirements set by UT Austin Promotion and Tenure guidelines. It is the personal responsibility of the candidate to prepare all file materials, as well as compile and order those materials to assure compliance with UT requirements. The appropriate role of administrative assistants is only for photocopying of materials.

The BC requires a candidate to provide additional supplemental materials for the benefit of the BC and the Dean that will be included in the file submitted to the Tower, if the UT Austin Executive Committee permits its inclusion. The statement will contain short comments that:

- * define the field or sub-field of the candidate with sufficient clarity so that the BC subcommittee will be able to identify appropriate external referees.
- * answer the question as to why the candidate should be promoted, addressing both the accomplishments of the candidate and the needs of the institution.
- * articulate what the candidate has accomplished in each of the three primary areas of consideration (teaching, research, and service) that include a discussion of outcomes.
- * report that the person 'stepped off' the tenure clock for any year, if a person has done so.
- * provide a reason why the person should be promoted early, if that is the request of the candidate.

The purpose for these advisory statements is that the BC should take into consideration these facts and opinions as part of its prima facie and promotion processes.

The BC also expects that any supplemental materials used by the BC promotion subcommittee and the BC should be included in the final BC file submitted to the Dean. The BC subcommittee will be expected to submit a minimum of six letters from external referees to the BC. Any BC subcommittee will submit supplemental materials regarding research, teaching, and service, as described in the appropriate sections below.

Research Documentation

All the materials required by UT Austin will be included in the research files considered by the BC for promotion. The BC requires supplemental materials that assess the outcomes of the research (impact and significance) of the candidate for promotion, not just the quantity and quality of the research. The BC leaves to each specific promotion subcommittee to determine methods to measure outcomes. The

BC requires that the candidate and the BC subcommittee include in the research statement comments about plans for future research and the research trajectory.

Service and Practical Experience Documentation

All the materials required by UT Austin will be included in the service files considered by the BC for promotion. The statement to the BC requires supplemental materials that address practical experience as well as service outside of the academic community, including work for governments or non-profit organizations. The BC requires supplemental materials that assess the outcomes of the practical experience and service (impact and significance) of the candidate for promotion, not just the quantity and quality of practical experience and service. The BC leaves to each specific promotion subcommittee to determine methods to measure outcomes. The BC requires that the candidate and the BC subcommittee include in the service statement comments about plans for future practical experience and service.

Teaching Documentation

All the materials required by UT Austin will be included in the teaching files considered by the BC for promotion. The BC requires supplemental materials to assess the outcomes of the teaching of the candidate for promotion, not just the quantity and quality of the teaching. The BC leaves to each specific promotion subcommittee to determine methods to measure outcomes. The BC requires that the candidate and the BC subcommittee include in the teaching statement comments about the plans for future teaching.

The BC recognizes that the LBJ School has established its own internal process for evaluating teaching outcomes as part of its preparation for each seven-year cycle of peer review and certification of the curriculum. If there are such materials germane to evaluating a faculty member's teaching, they should be included as a supplement to sole reliance on anonymous student evaluations. The BC welcomes voluntary submission by a promotion candidate materials that document or evaluate teaching outcomes; such materials will be passed through to the Dean and to the UT Austin Executive Committee, if the Tower's rules permit its inclusion.

Evaluation of Teaching for Tenure Candidates

A key element in the teaching evaluation process for persons seeking promotion to tenure will be the set of semester-by-semester reports of a BC standing subcommittee on peer evaluation of teaching. Beginning in Fall 2011, the BC Chair shall appoint each year a standing Teaching Evaluation Committee (TEC). The purpose of the TEC is to provide consistent, semester-by-semester peer evaluations of the teaching effectiveness of each untenured faculty up for promotion and Assistant Professor and each Associate Professor who has served between six to nine years in grade. The TEC will propose its own rules during Fall 2011, and those rules will supersede the text below in this section.

The TEC will have three ongoing responsibilities. It shall establish BC criteria for peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness. It shall develop a standard process for

evaluating teaching effectiveness. The TEC will conduct and report in writing on the results of at least one in-person peer evaluation of each faculty member subject to review each semester, using the standard evaluation procedures. The criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness should consider at least the (a) quality of the intellectual content of the course; (b) the quality of the teaching practice in the course; (c) the quality of student understanding from the course; (d) evidence of the instructor's teaching development; and (e) outcomes from the teaching process.

A BC subcommittee consisting of the Associate Dean (Professor Stolp), the two Graduate Advisors (Professors Weaver and Wong), and Professor Angela Evans have been asked to propose a TEC structure, function, criteria and process to the BC prior to the end of September 2011. The reason for this schedule is that the BC wishes for a BC-approved process to be in place for any promotion cases for the 2012-13 promotion cycle.

The BC requires TEC review of each Assistant Professor each semester. The BC requires that the set of TEC reviews of the teaching of any candidate for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure be included in the promotion file. The BC requires that the set of TEC evaluations of the teaching of any Associate Professor who wishes to be considered for promotion to Full Professor be included in the promotion file.

The BC encourages any professor being considered for post-tenure review to permit a voluntarily TEC review of her/his course.

Any faculty member who wishes to have an independent peer review of her/his teaching for any other purpose can utilize the TEC on a voluntary basis. Such "voluntary" TEC reviews can be carried out on a confidential basis.

The Chair of the TEC committee and the candidate to be reviewed should agree as to which members of the TEC should conduct any review. The BC does not want to be put in a position that anyone could claim that the process is either designed to 'rubber stamp' or 'undermine' a colleague who is under review. The TEC is established to provide an unbiased and consistent set of peer teaching reviews over time, so that the BC, the Dean, and the Tower can have confidence that the LBJ School BC has valid and reliable alternatives to supplement sole reliance on anonymous student evaluations.

The reason for the TEC is that previous peer efforts to evaluate teaching have been inconsistent and insufficient to achieve their intended purposes. UT Austin's Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) has agreed to provide training to the members of the TEC to assure a thorough, consistent, and constructive set of peer evaluations.

The UT Austin's CTL is willing to assign one of their staff members to visit and assess any LBJ School course. Any CTL review is separate from the LBJ School's TEC review process. A CTL class review would provide a confidential evaluation of a

class to help the faculty member. The CTL review can provide any faculty member with a constructive report on improving teaching effectiveness. Such CTL reports are confidential by policy and provided for the benefit of the faculty member alone.

Evaluation of Teaching for Candidates Seeking Promotion to Full Professor

The BC believes that any person seeking promotion from Associate to Full Professor will have a stronger file if the TEC has been able to conduct more than a semester or a year's worth of peer teaching evaluations. Therefore, the BC encourages Associate Professors to invite TEC review of their courses as early and as frequently as appropriate. Associate Professors who wish to be considered for promotion are required to have TEC evaluations for at least four semesters while in that rank.

Expectations of Candidates for Early Promotion to Tenure

The policies of the Office of the UT Austin President and the Office of the Provost regarding early promotion to tenure are not as detailed as members of the BC would wish. Therefore, the BC has established two criteria for early promotion, as listed below.

- * The candidate must have exemplary performance in teaching, research, and service, at a minimum, in order to be considered for early promotion.
- * The BC must be able to provide a cogent reason for the early promotion that has a reasonable likelihood of success.

The BC expects that any candidate for early consideration for promotion will be outstanding in each of three elements of review independent of the others, in research, teaching, and service. In effect, exemplary performance has become a required minimum standard for early promotion consideration. The BC and the School (or College) is expected to give a reason for an early promotion. A 'preference of the candidate for early consideration' is not considered a reason that has a high probability of success.

A faculty candidate should recognize that early consideration could result in a 'no promotion' decision.

Any candidate for early promotion may withdraw from the promotion process at any time prior to the consideration of the case by the Tower. This means that a candidate may withdraw prior to the prima facie case; after the prima facie case; prior to the request for external peer reviews; prior to the BC subcommittee recommendation; after the BC subcommittee recommendation to the Dean; or after the Dean's recommendation. The BC does not want to be in a position of moving a file forward if the candidate is unwilling.

As the BC must inform the Dean and the Tower of any pending promotion case prior to approximately May 10 (the date will vary by year), any withdrawal after that date will be known to the Tower. If a candidate changes her/his mind and seeks not to

be put forward, it is beyond the scope of the BC's expertise to evaluate how the Dean or the Tower will perceive that action.

Hiring With Tenure

The schedule for considering a person who does not have tenure at another university who wishes to be hired with tenure will reflect the timing of the hiring process. It is the BC's right and responsibility to evaluate and make a recommendation regarding any person seeking tenure within the LBJ School.

The BC's general expectation in hiring will be that a person at an Assistant Professor position in another institution should be hired as an Assistant Professor at the LBJ School. If early consideration for promotion is an element in the hiring process, the BC expects that the Dean will include correspondence as part of the hiring process that indicates that there is an expectation of an early consideration for tenure and promotion.

The BC recognizes that there may be a rare case where a person is so senior as an Assistant Professor at another institution that expedited consideration for tenure could be part of the hiring process. In such a case the BC will conduct an expedited full tenure review as part of the hiring process, and make a recommendation to the Dean and the Tower. The BC expects that any candidate who wishes to be hired with tenure will provide in a timely manner prior to BC consideration all of the materials that UT Austin requires of any candidate for promotion.

The BC Chair will establish a conventional BC subcommittee to conduct a full tenure review to make a recommendation to the BC and the Dean prior to the hiring decision. That BC subcommittee will be expected to obtain a minimum of six external peer reviews of the person seeking tenure, with at least half of the external reviews from peers that the candidate did not select and who are not persons who serve as references for the hiring process.

A person who already has tenure at another university does not need to go through an abbreviated tenure process. The BC will make a decision whether to hire the person with tenure as part of its hiring process.