Preamble

The standards and procedures for faculty review set forth herein are designed to promote and maintain excellence in the quality of the faculty at The University of Texas at Dallas and apply only to non-visiting faculty holding the ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor.

The faculty is charged through the ad hoc committees and the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel (CQ) with the evaluation of the academic qualifications of faculty members who are under consideration for reappointment, promotion, or tenure. The President, acting on advice from the faculty and other factors such as University needs and budgetary limitations, is responsible to the Chancellor and to the Board of Regents for final decisions on recommendations for promotion, reappointment, and tenure.

Standards

The University recognizes three categories of standards of performance in matters of promotion, reappointment and tenure. They are (a) creative productivity and professional achievement; (b) teaching effectiveness; and (c) University citizenship, that amorphous blend of willingness to participate actively as citizens in the life of the University and as collegial representatives of the University in extramural settings. Faculty in the tenure track are expected to perform well in each arena, and they are expected to demonstrate excellence as teachers, as creative professionals, or both.

The University of Texas at Dallas is an institution where strong graduate programs thrive in concert with excellence in undergraduate instruction. The University intends to promote quality scholarship and artistic achievements as well as effective teaching. A salutary climate for graduate and undergraduate instruction is promoted by the excitement of original investigation and exploration, whether this be scholarly or artistic. All members of the UTD faculty are expected to perform well in categories (a), (b), and (c) and to demonstrate excellence in at least (a) or (b).
Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement

Evidence of research and of scholarly or creative achievements should include publication in peer-reviewed journals; monographs which contribute to advancing knowledge or its utilization in the resolution of societal problems; development of widely adopted clinical or educational techniques which advance the quality of life; presentations at professional gatherings; and visual and other artistic contributions in regional and national exhibitions.

It is the responsibility of the Dean and faculty of each School to provide guidelines for peer review that articulate the substance of the standards concerning creative productivity and professional achievement expected of a faculty member. The standards should define the philosophy and objectives of the various academic programs. These guidelines should be made available to all faculty in each School, and a copy should accompany the file of a candidate under review through all the stages of review.* (*Guidelines are attached.)

School Guidelines are intended to supplement and not substitute for the standards detailed for Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement. Accordingly, the guidelines should be applied in concert with the standards, and should not be misunderstood as superseding the standards in any way.

Teaching

Because of the difficulties in measuring teaching effectiveness, it is extremely important that ad hoc committees seek a variety of ways to evaluate an individual's teaching. Teaching effectiveness is not to be measured solely in terms of teaching in organized courses. The willingness and ability to supervise Independent Studies and direct graduate students towards preparation for qualifying examinations and in preparing theses and dissertations is a major function of faculty in most Schools of the University. The willingness, or lack of it, to engage in teaching of undergraduate and interdisciplinary courses, of Teacher Education courses and student teaching supervision, of core or required courses, teaching of evening or Saturday courses, etc., should also be considered as part of the faculty member's overall profile as a teacher. Additionally, the willingness and ability to undertake certain types of administrative activities that are directly related to curriculum development, and to assume duties of student advisement, should be considered part of an individual's teaching effectiveness. Additional evidence of a faculty member's contribution to improve teaching effectiveness would be the development, implementation, and publishing of innovative educational methods.

University Citizenship

All faculty members are expected to participate as citizens in the life of the University. Citizenship and service to the academic community typically include membership in governance bodies and committees, administrative duties, program planning and development, public service, and special assignments from the President.
Procedures

The procedures for the review of non-tenured tenure track faculty members for promotion, reappointment, and/or tenure, and for the review of tenured Associate Professors for promotion to Professor are intended to provide for a thorough and impartial review of the qualities of each faculty member in terms of the standards set forth above.

In accordance with the Regents' Rules and Regulations, Rule 31007, Section 5.1, for purposes of calculating the period of probationary service prior to a review for tenure, an "academic year" shall be the period from September 1 through the following August 31.

If a faculty member is initially appointed during an academic year, the period of service from the date of appointment until the following September 1 shall not be counted as academic service toward fulfillment of the maximum probationary period. One year of probationary service is accrued by at least nine months full-time academic service during any academic year. A faculty member shall be considered to be on full-time academic service when in full compliance with Regental standards pertaining to minimum faculty workloads.

A faculty member who determines that certain personal circumstances may impede his or her progress toward achieving demonstration of eligibility for recommendation of award of tenure may make a written request for extension specifying the reason(s) for the requested extension. Personal circumstances that may justify the extension include, but are not restricted to, disability or illness of the faculty member; status of the faculty member as a principal caregiver of a preschool child; or status of the faculty member as a principal caregiver of a disabled, elderly, or ill member of the family of the faculty member. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide appropriate documentation to adequately demonstrate why the request should be granted.

The request for extension shall be limited to one academic year. A request for an additional academic year's extension will follow the established request process, with the maximum duration of extension, whether consecutive or nonconsecutive, to be two academic years.

Normally, requests for extension must be made in advance of the academic year or semester for which the extension is desired and may be made no later than three months prior to the deadline for initiation of the mandatory review process to determine recommended award of tenure, or notice, as provided under Rule 31002, Section 1 of the Regents' Rules and Regulations, that the next year will be the faculty member's terminal year of the appointment.

The decision regarding the request shall be made by the Chief Academic Officer (Provost), upon recommendation of the Department Head and the Dean, within 30 working days from the date the request is received in the Office of the Provost.

It is the policy of The University of Texas at Dallas that tenure-track faculty who are not awarded tenure at the end of the sixth academic year of their probationary service be given notice of non-renewal and be appointed to one year of terminal service. Therefore, a review and decision for faculty serving their sixth year in a rank is mandatory. In all other instances, the timing for recommendations for tenure and promotion, or for non-renewal of appointment,
is discretionary. Once an ad hoc committee has been formed and has decided to proceed with a discretionary tenure review (in particular, after the soliciting of outside letters has begun), the review will not be interrupted. Normally, all tenure reviews are definitive and end with a decision to promote or to issue a notice of terminal year appointment. Newly appointed tenure-track faculty members will be notified in their letter of appointment of the number of years of prior service, if any, credited toward satisfaction of the probationary period of service at The University of Texas at Dallas. Credit for prior service will not exceed three years.

In the first two years of service, faculty may be recommended for non-reappointment by the Faculty Personnel Review Committee, the Dean, and the Provost, without formal ad hoc committee review. Faculty in the first year of service will be notified of non-reappointment by March 1, and faculty in the second year will be notified of non-reappointment by December 15. The appointment of faculty who are so notified will terminate with completion of that contract year. Faculty in the third, fourth, or fifth years of service may be recommended for non-reappointment on the basis of an ad hoc committee review. Written notification of non-reappointment must be provided by July 30, and the faculty member is entitled to a terminal academic year of appointment.

For Assistant Professors, tenure decisions typically will be made in the sixth year of service. Assistant Professors may request a tenure review prior to the sixth year of service with the understanding that the decision reached as a result of that review will either be to promote to Associate Professor with tenure or to issue a notice of terminal year appointment. A faculty member appointed initially without tenure must serve one academic year at The University of Texas at Dallas under normal teaching load conditions before being considered for tenure. As a general rule, a critical review of an Assistant Professor's prospects for tenure should occur in the third year of service in that rank.

Reviews conducted during the third and tenure-decision years should include recommendations from an ad hoc committee, the Dean, the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel (CQ), and the Provost, with final action taken by the President. The third-year review should decide, if possible, whether the performance of the faculty member demonstrates a potential for tenure at a subsequent point of tenure review. A notice of non-reappointment and a terminal year of appointment may occur if the faculty member under review demonstrates extreme inadequacy in original investigation or teaching. Following the third-year review, the faculty member should be advised of desired future achievements.

Professional progress conferences may be held at an appropriate time each year at the request of a non-tenured faculty member. These conferences should enable the faculty member to have some assessment of his or her professional progress, with emphasis on each of the basic elements on which the professional quality of a faculty member's performance is based namely, teaching effectiveness, creative productivity and professional achievement, and University citizenship.

The dates given in the schedule below are deadlines and should be followed as closely as possible. For promotions to the rank of Professor, the Provost is encouraged to advance the review process so that the ad hoc committee review may begin in the preceding Spring.
Schedule of Review Process for Faculty Who are beyond the Second Year of Service

- Faculty Personnel Review Committee Recommendation and notification to faculty member and the Provost by the Dean
  - Third-Year Reappointment Review: April 1
  - Tenure or Tenured Faculty Review: April 1
  - Professor Review: April 1
- Request from Provost to faculty seeking promotion to Professor to update their files by April 15
  - Professor Review: April 1
- Establishment of ad hoc Review Committees for promotion to Professor; review by Deans’ Council; appointments made
  - Professor Review: April 8
- Request from Provost to third-year and T/TT faculty to update their files by September 1
  - Third-Year Reappointment Review: April 15
  - Tenure or Tenured Faculty Review: April 15
- Establishment of ad hoc Review Committees and notification to third-year and T/TT faculty to consult with Dean
  - Third-Year Reappointment Review: April 15
  - Tenure or Tenured Faculty Review: April 15
- Deans' Council make final ad hoc Review Committee assignments for third-year and T/TT reviews
  - Third-Year Reappointment Review: April 15
  - Tenure or Tenured Faculty Review: April 15
- Provost, Ad Hoc Review Committee Chairs, and Chair of CQ Meeting for third-year and T/TT reviews
  - Third-Year Reappointment Review: September 1
  - Tenure or Tenured Faculty Review: September 1
- File with ad hoc Review Committee report forwarded to Dean
  - Third-Year Reappointment Review: November 1
  - Tenure or Tenured Faculty Review: December 15
  - Professor Review: November 1
- File with ad hoc Committee report and recommendation of Dean forwarded to CQ
  - Third-Year Reappointment Review: November 21
  - Tenure or Tenured Faculty Review: January 15
  - Professor Review: November 21
- File with recommendation of Dean and recommendation of CQ forwarded to Provost
  - Third-Year Reappointment Review: December 21
  - Tenure or Tenured Faculty Review: February 15
  - Professor Review: December 21
- File with recommendation of Provost forwarded to President
  - Third-Year Reappointment Review: January 15
  - Tenure or Tenured Faculty Review: March 1
  - Professor Review: January 15
• Notice of Appointment to faculty member from President
  ◦ Third-Year Reappointment Review: April 1*
  ◦ Tenure or Tenured Faculty Review: April 1*
  ◦ Professor Review: April 1*

* This is a target date; the President is obligated to provide notice of non-renewal to faculty beyond their second year of probationary service by July 30.

Faculty Review Files

A faculty member who will be reviewed under this policy for reappointment, granting of tenure and/or promotion is responsible for preparing the file which will constitute the essential basis for this review. The Review File as submitted by the faculty member to the Office of the Provost will include a complete professional vita from the faculty member which covers the areas of research, teaching, and service; copies of the five most significant publications or creative works; a written evaluative description of the publications or creative works that the faculty member believes are most pertinent to the tenure and/or promotion judgments; and, for review which may result in granting of tenure and/or promotion, a list in a marked, sealed envelope of at least six but not more than twelve individuals recommended as external evaluators of the faculty member’s professional qualifications and contributions. Normally these evaluators will be drawn from above-rank faculty, or their equivalent. In addition, all internal third-year, sixth-year, tenure, and full Professor reviews should be accompanied by statistical summaries of the teaching evaluation form for each course taught during the previous six regular, long semesters (including transcripts of or original comments by students). Statistical summaries and student comments should be obtained from the School Dean. The Review File should also include any other available information regarding teaching effectiveness, such as copies of syllabi and exams. Upon receipt of the basic Review File from the faculty member, the Office of the Provost will inventory the contents and insert a copy of the inventory in the file.

The basic Review File will be transferred from the Office of the Provost to the faculty member’s ad hoc committee at the appropriate point in the review cycle. The ad hoc committee will work with the faculty member in assuring that the Basic Review file as submitted is supplemented and completed as necessary. All additions or changes in the file shall be noted on the inventory sheet, with copies of alterations sent to the Office of the Provost.

The ad hoc committee has the authority and responsibility to add material to the basic Review File; these additions being clearly identified in the “ad hoc committee” component of the Review File. Possible additions will include items such as the letters from above-rank external and internal evaluators for the ad hoc committee’s review of teaching performance, and the ad hoc committee’s recommendations. All these additions will be entered on the file inventory sheet.
Faculty Right to Files

If a faculty member requests to see his or her file during the review process, then (depending on who is in possession of the file at the time of the request) the Chair of the ad hoc committee, or the Chair of the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel (CQ), or the Dean is required to send the file promptly to the Office of the Provost, where it will be made available to the faculty member.

Faculty Personnel Review Committee

Faculty Personnel Review Committees are chaired by the Dean of the School and must include at least four tenured faculty members from the School appointed by the Dean or elected by the faculty. If appointed, service on the Faculty Personnel Review Committee should rotate among the tenured faculty on a staggered annual cycle with no appointment to exceed two years. If elected, terms should be for two years with no members succeeding themselves. Only tenured faculty may serve on this committee, and recommendations regarding tenured Associate Professors may be made only by tenured Professors.

All faculty members other than Professors will have their previous year's work reviewed annually by the Faculty Personnel Review Committee. This annual review can lead to:

1. A recommendation that an ad hoc committee be composed to assess the faculty member's suitability for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, or
2. In the case of faculty in their first or second year of service, to a recommendation that the faculty member not be reappointed.

These recommendations will be communicated by the Dean to the Provost according to the schedule.

A faculty member may request an ad hoc committee review even if the School's initial decision is not to initiate such a review. Such requests will be submitted to the Dean of the School for recommendation to the Provost.

Ad Hoc Committees

Ad hoc committees are formed to review faculty upon the recommendation of the Faculty Personnel Review Committee or, given a request of a faculty member, on the recommendation of the Dean. Ad hoc committees are composed of five tenured above-rank faculty members nominated by the Deans and appointed by the Provost. Where possible, the ad hoc committee should include three members of the specific areas of competence of the faculty member under review. In cases where a School has too few tenured faculty relative to the number of cases to be considered, the number of ad hoc committee members may be reduced to four. At least one, but no more than two, member(s) of the committee will be appointed from outside the School, and no fewer than two will be appointed from within the School. Candidates will be notified of the composition of the ad hoc committee and may discuss its possible re-composition with the Dean, if they prefer.
Soon after ad hoc committees are appointed, the Provost shall convene a meeting of their Chairs with the Chair of the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel (CQ) to go over the requirements of the review process.

The task of the ad hoc committee is to conduct a thorough review of the faculty member's qualifications for promotion, reappointment, and/or tenure. It is not the role of the ad hoc committee to serve as a partisan for or against the faculty member. Weaknesses should be addressed as well as strengths. With regard to the substance of the review, the ad hoc committees are asked to assess qualifications of the faculty member in terms of the University's standards.

The ad hoc committee has the authority to solicit information and opinions from any other sources in order to conduct a thorough review. In soliciting such information, the ad hoc committee is not bound to send the exact publications or creative works identified within the written evaluative description of the publications or creative works submitted by the faculty member; however, any deviations should be justified. For third-year reviews, above-rank faculty colleagues should be given the opportunity to provide written individual opinions to the ad hoc committee for its consideration. For tenure reviews and promotion reviews, the ad hoc committee should solicit written individual opinions from above-rank faculty colleagues.

For tenure or promotion recommendations, the ad hoc committee should obtain opinions concerning the faculty member's professional qualifications from at least five external authorities, these authorities being selected without prior reference to the list of external authorities provided by the faculty member as potential evaluators. Normally these evaluators should be drawn from above-rank faculty, or their equivalent. To ensure the independence of the committee's choices from the candidate's recommendations, the candidate's recommendations should be submitted in an appropriately marked, sealed envelope. After the committee's choices have been determined, additional references as suggested by the candidate can be added to the list of those to be contacted. Requests for evaluation of the candidate should follow the example letter provided to the ad hoc committees and should state clearly that tenure review files may be inspected by the faculty member. The credentials of the external reviewers should be reported in sufficient detail to establish their competence to make the evaluations requested of them. The ad hoc committee report should state the total number received, and the number outstanding at the time of forwarding the file to the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel (CQ). The ad hoc committee should clearly indicate which reviewers were chosen by the committee and which were chosen just by the candidate. Reappointment and termination recommendations for third-year faculty may be based solely on the solicitations of internal appraisals and the judgment of the ad hoc committee.

Also, for tenure and promotion reviews, tenured faculty members of rank higher than the faculty member under review are charged with reviewing the ad hoc review file and shall offer collective as well as individual judgments. In accord with each School's bylaws, the collective judgment will be in the form of a secret ballot by the above-rank faculty in favor of or in opposition to the promotion and/or tenuring of the faculty member under review. If school bylaws do not provide a policy on voting, the faculty voting shall be the faculty of the school or department in which the person under review has teaching and/or administrative
responsibilities. The vote must take place after the ad hoc review file has been assembled, including the ad hoc committee's written report, and before the file is forwarded to the Dean. No one shall vote who has not read the ad hoc review file. All votes must be accompanied by signatures of everyone who has voted attesting to the fact that the above-rank faculty member has read the file. All faculty voting will sign a letter reporting the vote and summarizing the discussion. The letter will be written by a member of the faculty who will be chosen by the faculty present at the time of the vote. Any written recommendations of any kind added to the file must be signed by all those participating in the recommendation.

Ad hoc committees, in judging the merits of a faculty member, should ignore entirely any anonymous material that may have found its way into a review file. Material may be anonymous because it is not signed or because, even though signed, it reports anonymous or secondhand (hearsay) evidence. Appraisals of teaching taken in accord with School and University policy on the evaluation of teaching are not anonymous material in this sense, provided that there exists a chain of certification in which those making the original judgments were not anonymous to the person(s) preparing summaries of and/or transmitting the original report(s). Student comments on teaching evaluation forms, although anonymous, may be considered as part of the evaluation of teaching.

Recommendations of ad hoc committees and the attendant evidence are to be forwarded to the Dean for further review. The report of the ad hoc committee should be signed by all committee members.

Dean

Upon review of the ad hoc committee file, the Dean shall append the Dean's recommendation to the file and forward the file to the Committee on Qualifications.

Committee on Qualifications

The Committee on Qualifications is composed of twelve tenured faculty members, two from each School with the exception of General Studies, appointed by the President with the advice of the Academic Council. Normally the Committee should be composed of full professors. Administrators above the level of Department Head are not eligible to serve. Recommendations concerning the promotion of Associate Professors to full Professors will be made only by the full Professors on the Committee. The Committee is advisory to the Provost and is responsible for certifying that the evidence in the file substantiates the recommendations of the ad hoc committee and the Dean. The Committee may not solicit data on its own. The Committee on Qualifications forwards the file with its recommendations to the Provost. The report of the Committee on Qualifications should be signed by all committee members present at the discussion of that file.

Chief Academic Officer

The Provost is responsible for reviewing all of the files related to faculty promotions, reappointments, and tenure, and for making a recommendation to the President regarding
each. Before issuing a recommendation for or against promotion of a faculty member to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, or for tenure, which is contrary to the recommendation of a Dean, the Committee on Qualifications, or the ad hoc committee, the Provost will first meet with the disagreeing Dean or Committee, and explore the reasons in the file leading to their recommendation. The Provost’s recommendation to the President must contain a summary of these discussions.

President

The President is responsible to the Chancellor and the Board of Regents for final decisions on recommendations for reappointments, promotions, and tenure.

Post Decision Notification

Following the President's decision, the President will inform the Provost who will convey the President's decision to the faculty member, the Dean, the Chair of the Committee on Qualifications, and the Chair of the ad hoc committee.

Appeal

Procedures for appeal of a decision on reappointment, promotion, or tenure are in Rule 31008, Section 6.1 of the Regents' Rules and Regulations.

School Guidelines

School of Arts and Humanities

The following guidelines serve to elaborate and provide greater specificity to the Standard of Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement for the review of faculty in the School of Arts and Humanities.

The creative productivity and professional achievement of faculty members in the School of Arts and Humanities is demonstrated primarily in their published writing or in those artistic endeavors designated as appropriate to the faculty member's area of appointment. In the evaluation of a faculty member, credit may be given for contributions to professional conferences or public forums, informative writing for lay readers, or activities which advance humanistic and artistic understanding beyond the University, but which, in so doing, reflect favorably upon it. There is no question, however, that retention and advancement is based primarily on publications or creative artistic productivity.

Humanities

(Art and Performance/Aesthetic Studies, Literary Studies/Studies in Literature, Historical Studies/History of Ideas)
For faculty in the Humanities, evidence of creative productivity and professional achievement will normally take the form of the publication of a book or books, and/or chapters and essays in multi-authored publications, and/or articles in peer-review journals.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievement will be assessed in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. The candidate has selected research projects which will lead to significant results in the field.
2. The candidate has demonstrated through performance at UTD the ability to conduct independent research.
3. The candidate's independent research has contributed significantly to the field.
4. At what institutions would the candidate's productivity at the time of assessment justify promotion to tenure.

For promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievements will be assessed as follows:

1. Scholars in related fields recognize as notable the contributions of the candidate.
2. The candidate has made an impact in the field of the candidate's scholarly pursuits.
3. At what institutions would the candidate's productivity at the time of assessment justify promotion to Professor.

Art and Performance/Aesthetic Studies

For faculty in Art and Performance/Aesthetic Studies, evidence of creative productivity and professional achievement will be as follows:

ART AND PERFORMANCE/AESTHETIC STUDIES (THEATER): For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in Art and Performance/Aesthetic Studies (Theater), the following guidelines apply:

1. For actors and directors, recommendations for promotion and tenure are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of evidence of demonstrated excellence in performance or productions, including regional critical acclaim.
2. For technical directors, stage designers, and costume designers, recommendations for promotion and tenure are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of evidence of demonstrated excellence in productions on the UTD campus or elsewhere.

For promotion to Professor in Art and Performance/Aesthetic Studies (Theater), the following guidelines apply:

1. For actors and directors, recommendations for promotion and tenure are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of evidence of demonstrated excellence in performance or productions, including national critical acclaim.
2. For technical directors, stage designers, and costume designers, recommendations for promotion and tenure are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of evidence of demonstrated excellence through regional/national recognition in productions on the
ART AND PERFORMANCE/AESTHETIC STUDIES (VISUAL ARTS): For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in the Art and Performance/Aesthetic Studies (Visual Arts), the following guidelines apply:

1. For studio artists, recommendations for promotion and tenure are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of the demonstrated excellence of their exhibited work, including at least regional critical acclaim.

For promotion to Professor in Art and Performance/Aesthetic Studies (Visual Arts), the following guidelines apply:

1. For studio artists, recommendations for promotion are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of the demonstrated excellence of their exhibited work, including national critical acclaim.

LITERARY STUDIES/STUDIES IN LITERATURE (CREATIVE WRITING): For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in Literary Studies/Studies in Literature (Creative Writing), the following guidelines apply:

1. For Creative Writers, recommendations for promotion and tenure are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of the demonstrated excellence in creative writing, including publication and regional critical acclaim.

For promotion to Professor in Literary Studies/Studies in Literature (Creative Writing), the following guidelines apply:

1. For Creative Writers, recommendations for promotion and tenure are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of demonstrated excellence in creative writing, including publication and national critical acclaim.

School of Engineering and Computer Science

The following guidelines serve to elaborate and provide greater specificity to the Standards of Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement for the review of faculty in the School of Engineering and Computer Science.

Individuals will be evaluated on the basis of their present and potential future contribution to the fundamental basis of practice of the profession of engineering and/or computer science, and on the conduct of research of scholarly activity appropriate to the training of graduate students and advanced undergraduate students in the School. In addition, the relevance of the areas of contribution to the present and future needs of the School will be considered.

Candidates must compare favorably to the best individuals in his or her field at a comparable level of professional development. Promotion and tenure decision will also be predicated on the anticipation of improving upon, or at the very least maintaining, the following levels of performance.
Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will be based upon sufficient accomplishment to visibly demonstrate strong potential that the individual will become a leading teacher and scholar/researcher.

Promotion to Professor will be based upon the attainment of a sound scholarly reputation and national stature as a leading teacher and scholar/researcher.

To aid in determining the candidate’s satisfaction of the previously stated principles, the following issues will be considered:

1. Has the candidate demonstrated excellence, innovation and creativity in the initiation and completion of significant contributions to present and future practice as evidenced by: demonstrated improvements to industrial practice; creation of novel designs, development and dissemination of new theories, principles, and practices; patents applied for and granted; software developed and utilized; and related evidences of originality?
2. Does the candidate have the ability to attract external support at a level appropriate to the development and sustenance of an active research program in his or her area?
3. Has the candidate demonstrated the ability to successfully guide master's and doctoral students' theses and dissertations?
4. Is the candidate known and professionally active on a regional, national and international level as a consultant; as a participant in cooperative educational and research activities with industries, governments or universities; as an invited speaker or lecturer; and as a member of professional, scientific, honor society or academy boards, committees and activities?

Interdisciplinary Studies

The School of Interdisciplinary Studies provides an interdisciplinary approach to graduate and undergraduate education which advances understanding and the integration of knowledge in the Liberal Arts and Sciences tradition. The School emphasizes student centered, quality educational services.

The following guidelines serve to elaborate and provide greater specificity to the Standards of Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement and Teaching Performance for review of faculty in the School of Interdisciplinary Studies. These guidelines are intended to supplement, not supersede, the standards set forth by the University in UTDPP1077

Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement

Faculty must present evidence of an ability to sustain a successful academic career. Confirmation of creative productivity and professional achievement for faculty includes: publication in peer-reviewed journals, chapters, books or monographs; awards of grants and contracts; a superior record of professional practice and/or applied work.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, faculty performance will be assessed in accordance with the following guidelines:
1. The candidate has initiated research projects which will lead to significant results or applications in their field.
2. The candidate has demonstrated the ability to conduct independent research.
3. The candidate's independent work has contributed significant applications or results to the field.

For promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure, faculty performance will be assessed in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. The candidate has initiated research projects which have lead to significant results or applications in their field.
2. The candidate has made an impact with pure research and/or applications in the field of the candidate's scholarly pursuits. Do fellow professionals consider the candidate's contributions as they pursue their own work?
3. A total record comparable to that which would justify promotion at major universities.

**School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences**

The following guidelines serve to elaborate and provide greater specificity to the Standard of Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement for the review of faculty in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences.

The candidate must present evidence of an ability to maintain a successful scholarly career. The most significant evidence of creative productivity and professional achievement for faculty in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences is publication in peer-reviewed journals, chapters, books, or monographs. Other forms of evidence of scholarly work are reports on grants and contracts, and abstracts of presentations before prestigious professional groups. A significant record of publication in these various categories is expected from a typical faculty member in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences.

The Callier Center for Communication Disorders' presence in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences gives not only a distinctive quality to the School, but also a distinctive quality to some faculty appointments within the School. Faculty may have small to significant clinical responsibilities as part of their faculty duties. These clinical duties naturally impact the amount of effort that is devoted to teaching and scholarly productivity. These clinical responsibilities also introduce distinctive issues in the evaluation of contributions in the clinical role. The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences recognizes clinical contributions as being a component of the overall assessment of faculty contributions for those faculty holding appointments with clinical duties.

In general, faculty holding clinical appointments are expected to make teaching and scholarly contributions of equal quality to other faculty in the School but with a lesser expectation of the quantity of such contributions, proportionate to the percentage of time committed to clinical activity. The qualitative evaluation of clinical contributions is difficult given the private nature of the clinical process but there are some measures by which candidates may be reasonably evaluated. Criteria by which the School will evaluate clinical contributions may include: evidence that the candidate's clinical innovations have had an impact on clinical practice,
testimony from knowledgeable professionals who regularly interact with the clinical role of the candidate, sampling of client satisfaction with the candidate's services, leadership roles in clinical professional organizations on a state, regional, or national level, appointments to government or professional committees who oversee clinical preparation and certification, other evidence of clinical contributions including preparation of professional materials for dissemination of information, professional presentations and writings of a primarily clinical nature, and indices of clinical contributions to the community as well as the Callier Center.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievement will be assessed in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. The candidate's research has contributed significantly to the field and, where appropriate, the candidate's clinical innovations have had an impact on clinical practice.
2. The candidate has demonstrated through performance at UTD the ability to conduct independent research.
3. The candidate's independent research has contributed significantly to the field.
4. For candidates with clinical responsibilities as part of their academic appointment, evidence that clinical duties are performed in an excellent manner and that the candidate provides innovative and creative contributions in the clinical domain.

For promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievements will be assessed as follows:

1. Scholars in related fields recognize as notable the contributions of the candidate.
2. The candidate has made an impact in the field of the candidate's scholarly pursuits.
3. For candidates with clinical responsibilities as part of their academic appointment, evidence that clinical duties are performed in an excellent manner and that the candidate provides innovative and creative contributions in the clinical domain.

School of Management

The following guidelines serve to elaborate and provide greater specificity to the Standard of Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement for the review of faculty in the School of Management.

The School's purpose in reviewing faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure is to assure itself that the candidate is, and will continue to be, a creative and productive scholar, a lively and stimulating colleague, an active participant in the intellectual life of the University, and an enhancement to the University's distinction in the candidate's area. For the typical faculty member in this School, the chief form of evidence in the area of creative productivity and professional achievement is publication in peer-reviewed journals, and publication of important monographs, chapters, or books.

In cases of promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional (scholarly) achievement will be measured against four benchmarks:
1. Has the candidate initiated a program of research in a significant area?
2. Has the candidate demonstrated ability to conduct independent research in work accomplished at UTD?
3. To what degree has the candidate's independent research made a significant contribution to the candidate's field or profession?
4. At what institutions would the candidate's performance to date justify promotion and tenure?

For promotion to Professor, the following questions relating to professional achievement and productivity should be addressed and fully demonstrated:

1. Must fellow professionals consider the candidate's contributions as they pursue their own work?
2. What is the impact of the candidate's research on the candidate's field and profession as a whole?
3. At what institutions would the candidate's record justify promotion to the rank of Professor?

School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

The following guidelines serve to elaborate and provide greater specificity to the Standards for Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement for the review of faculty in the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. A paramount consideration is the overall value of faculty productivity and achievement in this area to the educational programs of the University.

For the typical faculty member in this School, publication in the peer-reviewed primary research literature, and publication of important monographs, book chapters, or books provide the most important forms of evidence.

In cases of promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the University must determine the desirability of an indefinite continuation of the candidate's appointment. Since any such evaluation is necessarily subjective, no generally applicable quantitative tests are possible, and the decision must rest on professional judgement. The candidate's record in Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement will be evaluated against the following criteria:

1. A record of published, independent research showing substantive quality, with sufficient quantity to give reasonable confidence of continued productivity.
2. A current research program which gives prospects of making significant contribution to the candidate's field.
3. Demonstrated ability to conduct independent research effectively at UTD.
4. A record of external funding from research grants or contracts appropriate to the candidate's seniority and specialty. The School is particularly interested in encouraging those types of support which reinforce its educational programs.
5. A total record comparable to that which would typically justify promotion to Associate Professor with tenure at major graduate-level universities.

In cases of promotion to the rank of Professor, the University must determine the candidate's
professional standing and leadership status, both inside and outside the University. It is expected that the candidate will meet criteria 1 - 4 above at levels corresponding to the more senior status and longer career history. The candidate's record will also be evaluated against the following criteria:

6. Achievement of a recognized position of leadership among the candidate’s peers in the scholarly world.

7. A total record comparable to that which would typically justify promotion to Professor at major graduate-level universities.

Science and Mathematics Education Within the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

Science/Mathematics Education faculty will be evaluated in the same areas of performance as for other faculty at The University of Texas at Dallas: Teaching, Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement, and University Service.

For these faculty, Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement will typically be expressed by authorship of peer-reviewed journal articles, textbooks, workbooks, teaching materials, and/or educational software as well as by invited presentations. Work of quality sufficient for publication in well regarded, refereed Science or Math Education journals is expected, but expectation of quantity of productivity will normally be tempered by recognition of other demands of such a faculty member’s time. The participation of a Science/Mathematics Education faculty member in student teacher supervision, local ISD in-service programs, accreditation visits, local/state/national organizations, and the like, is normally expected and exemplifies these demands, as does the requirement that such faculty teach in exemplary fashion.

Evaluation of Science/Mathematics Education faculty, in accord with the mission of the Science/Mathematics Education Department and the responsibilities it requires of the particular faculty member, thus differs only in the relative weights of the three areas from the typical faculty member in the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and in the nature of the publication outlets available to them.

School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences

The following guidelines serve to elaborate and provide greater specificity to the Standard of Creative Professional Achievement for the review of faculty in the School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences.

In great measure, the creative productivity and professional achievement of faculty members in the School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences is measured by their published writing. A solid record of scholarship would be evidenced by publications such as articles in peer reviewed journals, books, reports of research undertaken on grants or for clients, and chapters in books. Peer-reviewed journals and peer-reviewed books provide particularly strong evidence of scholarly productivity. These publications need not be restricted to traditional disciplines. The status of the publisher or journal is a consideration in evaluating
scholarship as is the frequency of citation of the research. Ordinarily, original research
directed at the academic and policy communities will be more heavily weighed than textbooks
directed toward students.

At the time of review the candidate should provide a statement of his/her research agenda. When seeking outside advice, in addition to the curriculum vita and related materials, reviewers should be provided with these School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences guidelines and the School's teaching load.

The ad hoc committee must address the following questions when considering a candidate's prospects for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure:

1. Has the individual initiated and sustained a research program which has and will continue to lead to significant results in his/her research area?
2. To what degree has the individual's research made an impact upon his/her field or to the design of public policies?
3. At what institutions would the individual's performance to date justify promotion and tenure?

For promotion to Professor, the following questions relating to creative productivity and professional achievement should be addressed.

1. Has the candidate continued to initiate and sustain a research program leading to significant results in his/her research area?
2. Must fellow professionals consider the candidate's contributions as they pursue their own work? Has the candidate's work enlightened issues of public policy?
3. At what institutions would the individual's performance to date justify promotion to the rank of Professor?

**Teacher Education**

The following guidelines serve to elaborate and provide greater specificity to the Standard of Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement for the review of faculty in Teacher Education.

Faculty who participate in the teacher education programs of UTD are expected to contribute to the literature in their field of education by publication in journals, books, edited volumes, monographs, and other appropriate media as evidence of creative productivity and scholarly achievement. The instructional duties of faculty in teacher education are especially demanding. Faculty in teacher education are expected, in addition to teaching organized courses, to supervise students in field settings including internships, practica, and student teaching. Such field experiences constitute a significant segment of the total preparation for teaching by a student and requires a high level of sensitivity, disciplinary competence, and pedagogical expertise on the part of the faculty who supervise these experiences. Faculty participation is also mandated by State Law to provide leadership for in-service workshops for public school teachers who work with student teachers; such leadership is critically reviewed by peers and contributes to the University's reputation in the region. Faculty also seek
positions of leadership and influence in local cooperative teacher education councils, since these councils make policy which helps define teaching field programs and field placement opportunities for the University. The teaching of curriculum and instruction courses and other education-related courses require levels of expertise in these fields commensurate with levels expected in disciplinary offerings.

While faculty in teacher education have heavy instructional responsibilities, the application of the standards of teaching effectiveness cannot substitute entirely for creative productivity and professional achievement. Teacher education faculty are expected to contribute to the literature in their field. While the rate of contribution may be tempered by instructional activities, the quality of the work is expected to be comparable to the better work in the field.
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