UTMB’S SCHOOL OF MEDICINE’S
APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE GUIDELINES
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I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION

The mission of The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston’s (“UTMB”) School of Medicine (“SOM”) is to educate physicians and scientists; advance knowledge through research; and provide health care for the people of the State of Texas and the world. Accomplishment of this mission requires a diverse faculty with a broad range of talents and expertise. Faculty recruitment, appointment, promotion, tenure, and retention are governed by standards set by UTMB’s individual Departments, UTMB’s SOM, and the University of Texas System. UTMB’s Institutional Handbook of Operating Procedures (“IHOP”) as well as the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas set forth the rules, regulations, and policies that govern all UTMB schools and should be consulted for any issues that may arise that are not addressed in these guidelines.

Consideration of appointment, promotion, and tenure (“APT”) must address fully the features of a professional identity and an academic career. Academic Health Centers (“AHC”) have undergone enormous changes in recent decades making the process of appointment, promotion, and tenure much more complex. Thus, the APT process must now take into consideration the varied career paths of individual faculty members. The meaning of tenure has also evolved within the academic enterprise from a concept associated with appointment and salary guarantees to a concept that implies value to the institution. Academic policies must recognize the current reality that medicine and biomedical science are practiced in a team setting. Given the multifaceted and individualized nature of modern careers in academic medicine, faculty development and mentoring, ideally with multiple mentors, are both critically important factors.

UTMB’s appointment, promotion and tenure process begins at the Department level (see Section V(B) below) and then proceeds to the SOM’s APT Committee, the SOM’s Executive Committee, UTMB’s Dean of the SOM, UTMB’s President, and the Board of Regents of the University of Texas for final approval.

Academic faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure policies must be aligned with the AHC’s diverse missions. The guidelines listed below provide examples of typical activities/criteria that may be used to document a faculty member’s academic achievements, as well as other accomplishments that may also be appropriate for consideration. The different faculty activities reflect different professional interests and AHC goals. However, the underlying tenet of these guidelines is that academic rank reflects the level of scholarly achievement and expanding reputation. Across missions, the level of scholarly activity must be comparable, although it may differ in type. In order to be considered scholarly products, these activities must have been evaluated by a faculty member’s peers and evidence of acceptance, approval, or endorsement must be documented.

In recognition of the complexity and diversity of the various missions of UTMB’s SOM, these guidelines for appointment, promotion, and tenure are focused on broad categories of achievement. These policies were established to be consistent with the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas and with the laws of the State of Texas. Each SOM Department should develop and publish a set of guidelines for use by the Departmental APT
Committee, consistent with these SOM APT Guidelines. To the extent that contradictions exist between any UTMB Department APT Guidelines and the SOM APT Guidelines, the SOM APT Guidelines will govern the APT proceedings.

Department APT Guidelines are for use within each Department to assist in establishing expectations for faculty members and may be more detailed or specific at some points. These Guidelines will be useful in the following ways: (1) to assist in identifying faculty members whom the Department considers eligible to be recommended for promotion or tenure; and (2) to develop the documentation needed for evaluation by the SOM APT Committee.

Department APT Guidelines should clarify expectations of faculty members. It is suggested that each annual evaluation session include time specifically dedicated to clarifying the institutional as well as departmental expectations for advancement. Faculty members should be given adequate opportunity to have all questions answered regarding the process for promotion and tenure. Mentoring opportunities in Departments and through the Academy of Research Mentors, the Academy of Master Teachers, the Academy of Master Clinicians and other organizations are available to help faculty members manage their academic career advancement.

II. FACULTY ACTIVITIES AND CONCEPTS OF SCHOLARSHIP

Nominees for appointment or promotion will be evaluated primarily on their contributions in the three principal missions of the University: (1) education; (2) research; and/or (3) patient care as well as their institutional service as described below. A successful faculty member will be expected to perform satisfactorily in all missions relevant to his or her career and to excel in one or more mission, depending on the track in which appointment, promotion, and/or tenure is sought (see further details in Section III).

Additionally, promotion of a faculty member is contingent on demonstrated scholarship appropriate to the relevant mission(s) and track as well as the extent of the faculty member’s professional reputation. Scholarship broadly conceived includes discovery, integration, application, and teaching in any of the principal missions of the University. Service to the University through committee or task force membership, and certain administrative positions is expected of every faculty member. However, service to the University by itself is not sufficient for promotion.

In each relevant mission, the creation of scholarly products that meet generally accepted standards of peer recognition is an essential component of the evidence of excellence, scholarship, and leadership. Additional documentation of the esteem in which the faculty member is held at international, national and regional levels may include:

1. Participation in grant review panels, consultant panels, and advisory boards, or their equivalent;
2. Career development awards or the equivalent;
3. Positions of leadership or responsibility in professional organizations, agencies and societies and federal agencies or their equivalent;
4. Appointments to editorial boards of scientific or professional journals;
5. Presentations at other academic institutions or organizations at regional, national, or international levels;
6. Elected membership in learned societies;
7. Services as a peer-reviewer for scientific journals;
8. Visiting faculty invitations;
9. Awards for excellence within a mission; and/or
10. Letters of evaluation from experts.

A. Education

Teaching is central to the mission of UTMB and the SOM, and it is an essential consideration for appointment or promotion to any rank or to the granting of tenure for the vast majority of faculty members. It is assumed that, except in special situations, all tenure-track faculty members will be involved in teaching. The degree of involvement in undergraduate, graduate, and continuing medical education, graduate student education, mentoring of post-doctoral and clinical fellows, or junior faculty mentoring will depend upon the scientific or clinical discipline and the area of primary responsibility of the faculty member. Because it is essential to document not only the extent to which a faculty member is involved in education, but also the quality and effectiveness of these efforts, submission of an educator portfolio is required if education is a mission of excellence for the candidate.

A template for the educator portfolio (“EP”) is provided at the Academy of Master Teachers (“AMT”) website, http://www.utmb.edu/amt/. The EP is a collection of evidence of the quality, quantity, and impact of one’s work as an educator. Specifically, it provides detailed descriptions of the activities, samples, evidence of quality, and evidence of dissemination among the community of educators (e.g., presentations or publications). An EP also includes the educator’s teaching philosophy, description of his or her journey of preparation to be a good educator, and/or reflections on his or her work. All areas of education may be represented in the EP, including: (1) direct teaching, assessment, mentoring, and advising; (2) the development of enduring educational materials; (3) and/or educational leadership roles.

Examples of educational activities may include, but are not limited to:

1. Direct teaching of students, residents, fellows, or peers in classroom, laboratory, or clinical settings;
2. Clinical, research, or simulation assessment activities;
3. Supervision, advising and mentoring of students, residents, and /or postdoctoral fellows in laboratory, clinical, or general academic settings;
4. Mentoring of faculty members;
5. Development and dissemination of enduring educational materials;
6. Education leadership roles; and/or
7. Publication of textbooks and chapters.

Evidence of scholarship in education may include, but is not limited to:

1. The quality of teaching activities, emphasizing peer evaluation, letters from colleagues, evaluations from learners, teaching awards, success and career paths of mentees;
2. The impact of enduring educational materials or innovative teaching methods including evidence of peer review, dissemination, and/or adoption or use by other courses, programs or institutions;
3. The effectiveness in education leadership roles including educational outcomes, course or program reviews and/or other measures of the quality of service;
4. Across educational activities, evidence of scholarship may include;
5. Original contributions to the literature;
6. Citations of candidate’s published or presented work by other educators;
7. Dissemination to the medical education community at the local, regional, national and/or international level through presentations, workshops and other forms;
8. Grant funding for educational activities or educational research; and/or
9. Recognition (such as awards) for education at the local, regional, or national level.

B. Research

Research is central to the mission of UTMB and the SOM and is an essential consideration for appointment or promotion to any rank or to the granting of tenure for many faculty members. The primary parameters relevant in evaluating scholarly research activity include, but are not limited to:

1. Significance and quality of contributions to the peer-reviewed literature, namely peer-reviewed journal articles. However, original scholarly books can also be evidence of publishing products. For books, the significance and quality of contributions to advance knowledge in the faculty member’s primary field (e.g., significant surgery books for surgeons) should be evaluated via published reviews of the work or through research citation index, in the support letters provided, and should be summarized in the cover letter accompanying the promotion package. The faculty member’s curriculum vitae (“CV”) should include measures or other indicators of the impact of the publications;
2. Demonstrated accomplishment as an independent and/or collaborative investigator.
This aspect primarily refers to leadership and can take the form of taking the lead, senior, and/or corresponding author role in published literature;

3. Demonstration of expertise/leadership in a definable field at the national/international level;

4. Major contributions to collaborative projects, including application of cutting-edge technology critically important for collaboration;

5. Exceptional facilitation of the work of many others or work that is by nature only collaborative that involves scholarly and creative contributions;

6. Leadership in establishing and maintaining collaborative research groups;

7. Funded research grant applications;

8. Innovation as exemplified by the acquisition of patents or other intellectual property;

9. Publication of textbooks and chapters;

10. Participation and presentation in regional, national, or international professional and scientific societies’ research conferences; and/or

11. Service to and leadership in regional/ national/ international organizations.

C. Clinical

Clinical excellence is expected from all faculty members participating in the University’s Faculty Service Research and Development Plan (“Faculty Practice Plan”). The practice of medicine is applied scholarship and can be assessed on the basis of evidence directly bearing on scholarship. When invoking clinical activity as a mission of excellence, the faculty member should be able to demonstrate clear goals, skills acquisition, the use of appropriate methods, and significant results.

Because it is essential to document not only the extent to which a faculty member is involved in clinical activities, but also the quality and effectiveness of these efforts, submission of a Clinician portfolio (“CP”) is required if clinical work is a mission of excellence for the candidate. In addition to the clinician’s reflective assessment of his or her clinical activities, supporting data from multiple sources are required. Quantitative data describing time and effort, clinical volume, or financial impact may be helpful, but are not a complete description of applied scholarship. Supporting data should address the physician’s use of modern methodology, appropriate responses to changing technology, and description of the importance of the specialized niche of clinical care provided. Peer review of the clinician’s impact on the teaching, clinical and research missions of the SOM is also important. Supportive material from former clinical trainees directly addressing the issue of scholarship may also be important.

In evaluating a clinical faculty member for appointment or promotion, consideration will be given to, among other things:
1. The extent and quality of clinical activities as assessed by health care quality metrics and the candidate’s qualified peers (e.g., for specialists, evaluation by consulting physicians; for primary care physicians, evaluation by consulted specialists);

2. Innovation in the practice and delivery of health care;

3. Activities related to the management of health care teams or the delivery of health care to groups of patients;

4. Participation in the routine affairs of the hospital and clinics;

5. Provision of essential services to the University hospitals and clinics;

6. Development of clinical outreach programs;

7. Dissemination of information, new clinical techniques and procedures in scholarly, peer reviewed publications, community outreach activities, and educational materials;

8. Participation in clinical discussions, tumor boards, journal clubs, and local scholarly presentations (e.g., grand rounds);

9. Publication of case reports, chapters, and/or textbooks;

10. Participation and presentation in regional or national professional society conferences; and

11. Service to and leadership in regional/ national/ international organizations.

**D. Community Service**

Activities that serve to interface the institution with the community and State of Texas are essential to the welfare of the institution and, therefore, are worthy of consideration in evaluating a faculty member. Uncommonly, community service may be of sufficiently high value to the University and comprise a sufficiently large portion of the faculty member’s time and effort that it can be considered as a mission of excellence in and of itself. In such cases, demonstrated scholarship is important in considering promotion. This may take the form of:

1. Grant funding for community-based projects;

2. Publications of methods and results of community-based activities;

3. Documentation of effects on public policies and/or community well-being;

4. Official commendations or awards from local, regional, or statewide entities;

5. Publications related to advocacy or education, including chapters, and/or textbooks;

6. Participation and presentation in regional or national professional society conferences; and
7. Service to and leadership in local/ regional/ national/ international organizations.

E. Institutional service

Service to the University is essential to demonstrate the faculty member’s commitment and value to the University. Both the quality and quantity of the service are important in consideration of promotion and especially toward the award of tenure. However, institutional service is not itself an independent academic mission for the purpose of promotion or tenure. Institutional service may include, among other things:

1. Appointed or elected service on SOM or university-wide committees, task forces, councils, etc.;

2. Holding administrative positions; and

3. Contributing to essential institutional activities that lie outside the three primary missions.

III. EXPECTATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION IN DIFFERENT FACULTY TRACKS

For appointment or promotion in either the tenure track or the non-tenure track, candidates will be primarily evaluated on their contributions in the areas of: (1) education; (2) research; and/or (3) patient care.

A. Tenure Track

Appointment to a position in the tenure track is appropriate for individuals who have demonstrated potential to be successful in two of the three academic missions of the University. Promotion of faculty members in the tenure track is contingent on a faculty member’s scholarly activity and expanding reputation, which may be demonstrated in research, teaching, and/or patient care. Documented evidence of excellence in at least two of the academic missions of the University is required, although the extent of activity and reputation need not be the same in all missions. Good citizenship is required through service to the University as members of committees, task forces, and certain administrative positions and is expected of every citizen of this school. However, service by itself is not sufficient for promotion. Faculty members who are appointed on the tenure track who do not meet the standards for promotion on this track shall have no expectation to be reassigned to a non-tenure track position.

1. Instructor

The title of Instructor denotes a probationary appointment. The Instructor usually joins the faculty with no previous academic appointment, and such appointments do not require the action of the SOM APT committee. Instructors can be considered for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor annually. Because time spent as Instructor in the tenure track accrues toward the maximum tenure probationary period of nine years, such
appointments should be made with careful consideration of expectations for scholarly activity and career advancement.

At the time of appointment, all Instructors must have a career development plan agreed among and signed by the Instructor, the immediate supervisor, the department chair, and the Dean of Medicine (or designee). The Instructor’s progress in this plan will be a part of the annual evaluation. After three to five years, it is expected that an Instructor will be moved either to an Assistant Professor position or to a Research Associate (non-faculty) position unless a revised time-limited career development plan is agreed among and signed by the Instructor, the immediate supervisor, the Department Chair, and the Dean of Medicine (or designee).

2. **Assistant Professor**

In all missions, this title is intended for individuals who have completed formal training and have sufficient potential to establish an academic career, to make meaningful contributions to the relevant missions of the University, and to make progress toward subsequent academic advancement. Appointment of a qualified individual as Assistant Professor should be used as a mechanism to recruit and retain talented personnel who are valuable to the SOM. These individuals are appointed by the Department Chair with the approval of the Dean without action of the SOM APT committee. In the research mission, this position is for an investigator with high potential and desire to develop an independent research career.

3. **Associate Professor**

The candidate should present evidence of a significant quantity and quality of activity in relevant areas of education, research, or clinical activities and should demonstrate a regional to national reputation. Objective evidence of quality of work should be provided. In the area(s) of concentration for the candidate, there must be evidence of independent scholarly productivity and at this stage, regional or national recognition. While the specifics will vary across missions, there must be evidence of scholarship (see Section II) with endorsement by peers. The clinician should be board certified (or foreign equivalent) in a discipline or specialty area. Lack of such certification should be explained by the Department Chair. The candidate’s documentation should present evidence of effective service to the institution. The candidate’s credentials will be evaluated by the Departmental APT Committee and recommendations made to the Chair.

4. **Professor**

Promotion to Professor connotes additional recognition for academic achievements. This appointment signifies that the individual has become established as an authority and leader in their discipline, with a national to international reputation. This should be documented

---

1 In rare circumstances, community service may constitute a mission of excellence; see Section II (D).
by letters from both UTMB faculty members and recognized experts at other institutions.

Another important criterion at this stage, building on the work of an Associate Professor, is evidence of sustained performance at the expert level in the academic missions relevant to the faculty member’s career. Documentation of continuing productivity and scholarship as described in Section II comprises evidence of such sustained performance.

The candidate’s documentation should present evidence of effective leadership in service to the institution. For instance, one may have gained the confidence of colleagues by being elected to a standing committee or committees involved in the functioning of the institution. The candidate’s credentials will be evaluated by the Departmental APT Committee and recommendations made to the Chair.

B. Non-Tenure Track

For promotion in the non-tenure track, a faculty member is expected to excel in at least one mission, with satisfactory performance in any others in which they participate. To qualify for promotion to a higher rank, non-tenure track faculty members should demonstrate excellence in at least one of their assigned areas of activity along with an expanding reputation. Scholarship—broadly conceived as described in section II above—is key to promotion, although the amount expected is less than in the tenure track. All faculty members at any rank are expected to participate in institutional service; significant contributions in this area should also be recognized when considering a faculty member's qualifications for promotion.

Entry level positions in the non-tenure track (NTT) include titles such as Lecturer, Instructor, or Assistant Professor. Such appointments are by agreement of the Department Chair and the Dean of Medicine. In instances where a highly experienced NTT faculty member is brought into the department, appointment at the Associate Professor or Professor level may be appropriate. Appointments at the Associate Professor level or above in the NTT must be approved through the SOM APT committee. Reappointment of faculty members in the non-tenure track is reviewed every year by the Department Chair and the Dean of Medicine. This decision is based on many factors, including the individual's productivity, value to the department or institution, and financial constraints.

1. **Lecturer**

This title may be used for individuals who will serve as Teachers and whose teaching experience and qualifications are comparable to those of faculty members in untenured, tenure-track positions. Upon approval by the President, UTMB may identify up to three divisions within this rank to be designated Lecturer I, Lecturer II, and Lecturer III.

2. **Instructor**

The title of Instructor denotes a probationary appointment. The Instructor usually
joins the faculty with no previous academic appointment, and such appointments do not require the action of the SOM APT committee. Instructors can be considered for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor annually.

At the time of appointment, all Instructors must have a career development plan agreed among and signed by the Instructor, the immediate supervisor, the department chair, and the Dean of Medicine (or designee). The Instructor’s progress in this plan will be a part of the annual evaluation. After three to five years, it is expected that an Instructor will be moved either to an Assistant Professor position or to a Research Associate (non-faculty) position unless a revised time-limited career development plan is agreed among and signed by the Instructor, the immediate supervisor, the Department Chair, and the Dean of Medicine (or designee).

3. **Assistant Professor**

In all missions, this title is intended for individuals who have completed formal training and have sufficient potential to establish an academic career, to make meaningful contributions to the relevant missions of the University, and to make progress toward subsequent academic advancement. Appointment of a qualified individual as Assistant Professor should be used as a mechanism to recruit and retain talented personnel who are valuable to the School of Medicine. These individuals are appointed by the Department Chair with the approval of the Dean without action of the School of Medicine APT committee.

4. **Associate Professor**

The candidate should present evidence of a significant quantity and quality of activity in relevant areas: education, research, clinical activities, and/or community service, and should demonstrate a regional to national reputation. Objective evidence of quality of work should be provided. While the specifics will vary across missions, there must be evidence of scholarship (see Section II) with endorsement by peers. The clinician should be board certified (or foreign equivalent) in a discipline or specialty area. Lack of such certification should be explained by the Department Chair.

5. **Professor**

Promotion to Professor connotes additional recognition for academic achievements. This appointment signifies that the individual has become established as an authority and leader in their discipline, with a national to international reputation. This should be documented by letters from both UTMB faculty members and recognized experts at other institutions.

Another important criterion at this stage, building on the work of an Associate Professor, is evidence of sustained performance at the expert level in the academic missions relevant to the faculty member’s career. Documentation of continuing productivity and scholarship as described in Section II comprises evidence of such
sustained performance.

The candidate’s documentation should present evidence of effective leadership in service to the institution. For instance, one may have gained the confidence of colleagues by being elected to a standing committee or committees involved in the functioning of the institution. The candidate’s credentials will be evaluated by the Departmental APT Committee and recommendations made to the Chair.

C. Movement between the Tenure Track and Non-Tenure Track

Movement from the tenure track to the non-tenure track is accomplished by recommendation of the Department Chair and subsequent approval by the Dean. Faculty members in non-tenure track positions may request transfer to the tenure track. Upon approval of the request by the Departmental Chair and the Dean, the faculty member must begin at the Assistant Professor rank, unless the usual Department and institutional APT process for the desired rank with or without tenure is successfully completed. To be appointed to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor when returning to the tenure track from a position in the non-tenure track, the candidate must complete the full APT process (beginning with the Department APT Committee), including approval of the Department Chair, SOM APT Committee, and the Dean, and meet the promotion standards of these ranks in keeping with the guidelines of the tenure track.

Part-time faculty members must still achieve the same level of accomplishment as full-time faculty members to attain promotions, though it is expected that they may require longer doing so.

Individuals in the tenure track who move from full-time to part-time positions and elect to remain on the tenure track must abide by the time limits for achieving tenure nine (“9”) years. However, it is recommended that such faculty members who have not achieved tenure change to the non-tenure track along with their change to part-time status, in order to stop the nine (“9”) year clock for achieving tenure. If they subsequently reinstate to full-time work, they can remain on the non-tenure track, or they may request movement back to the tenure track at the same rank, subject to the approval of their Department Chair and the Dean of Medicine.

D. Clinical Practice Track

Persons who are appointed to full or part-time positions exclusively for patient care activity may be appointed or promoted in the Clinical Practice Track as determined by the individual Department Chair in consultation with the Departmental APT Committee and approved by the Dean of Medicine. These actions do not require the approval of the SOM APT Committee. Promotion in the Clinical Practice Track will be based on excellence in the core mission, quality and volume of clinical activities and/or service to the institution.

These appointments are often made for individuals in clinical practice who have little opportunity for interchange with colleagues at UTMB. They can be given the title of Clinical Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor, or Clinical Instructor and will be reviewed by the Program Director, Department Chair and Dean of Medicine yearly in terms of the
individual's productivity, value to the Department or institution, and numbers of such appointments in a department. These titles may be used by the institution to designate regular part-time or full-time service on the faculty while involved in a professional clinical experience program. Appointments to the faculty with a clinical practice track title may be with or without pay and shall be for a period of time determined by the Department Chair in agreement with the Dean of Medicine but not to exceed three years. Such appointments shall terminate upon expiration of the stated period of appointment without notification of nonrenewal. If UTMB determines that it is to the benefit of the institution, it may offer reappointment to a clinical faculty member in accordance with the Texas Education Code Section 51.943.

E. Honorary Titles

The process for nominating retiring faculty members for honorary titles such as Professor Emeritus does not involve the SOM APT Committee; rather, that process is covered in a separate policy.

IV. TENURE

A. Definition and Significance

Tenure denotes a status of continuing employment as a member of UTMB’s SOM faculty, and the award of such is not automatic at any level of appointment. Tenure may be granted at the time of appointment to the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor, or tenure may be withheld pending satisfactory completion of a probationary period of faculty service.

The granting of tenure to a faculty member is recognition by UTMB and the University of Texas System Board of Regents that the individual has demonstrated sustained academic productivity and professional integrity, as well as educational and intellectual qualities that make him or her a desirable permanent member of the faculty. Objective documented evidence of sustained success in education, research, clinical activities, and/or community service must form an integral part of all recommendations for tenured positions, and correspondence should state clearly the basis for recommendations concerning tenure.

B. The Role of Institutional Service

Tenure is reserved for individuals who have demonstrated enduring value to the institution. “Enduring value” includes but also transcends scholarly achievements in the three primary missions of the institution to include sustained, substantial service to the school and university above and beyond their expected duties. Documentation of the quantity and quality of institutional service should include descriptions of activities and contributions and their impact as verified by committee chairs or administrators in charge of the activities. For new faculty appointments that include a request for tenure, consideration of the extent and impact of the candidate’s service contributions to his/her former institution will be equivalent to the requirement for service to UTMB by internal candidates.

C. Probationary Service in the Tenure Track
Appointment to a full-time position in the tenure track at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher initiates a probationary period related to the acquisition of tenure. Additionally, academic service in the position of Instructor may be counted toward the satisfaction of any maximum probationary period. Full-time service is defined as holding a 100% time appointment in the University for the entire academic year on faculty salaries and/or on any other funds administered by the University. The maximum probationary period that may be served in the tenure track is nine (“9”) years. Not later than the eighth (“8th”) year of full-time service in the tenure track, the Department Chair, with the input of the Department APT Committee as appropriate, shall determine whether: (1) the faculty member should be proposed for the award of tenure; (2) the faculty member should be transitioned to a non-tenure track appointment effective by the end of the ninth academic year; or (3) the faculty member should be placed on terminal appointment for the next full academic year.

D. Policies regarding Tenure

Policies concerning tenure, including the nine (“9”) year maximum probationary period, extension of the probationary period, granting of tenure, periodic evaluation of tenured faculty members (“post-tenure review”), and provisions for the termination of employment of faculty members with tenure are detailed in the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents of The University of Texas System, Rules 31007, 31008, and 31102, and the Institutional Handbook of Operating Procedures for The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston.

All recommendations for tenure and reappointment of non-tenured tenure-track faculty members are subject to the notice and approval of UTMB’s President and the Board of Regents of the University of Texas System. The President has the authority to accept, reject or modify all recommendations forwarded and also may make decisions with regard to the renewal of appointment or non-renewal of appointment without any prior recommendation. At all times, the award of tenure is subject to the approval of the Board of Regents.

The University APT Committee will consider the recommended rank and tenure separately. There should be no expectation that promotion and the award of tenure are linked. When both decisions are requested at the same time, the supporting evidence provided in the packet should speak to each request separately. If the application for the award of tenure is submitted separately and after promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, updated documentation and new supporting letters are required.

E. Award of Tenure to Faculty Members in the Non-Tenure Track

From time-to-time, the SOM may wish to recommend tenure for a Professor in the non-tenure track in recognition of long-term excellence and service to the school and/or university. This honor is reserved for exceptional service and excellence in the clinical, education, and/or research missions for at least ten years after promotion to Professor. Although the scholarship requirements for this recognition differ from those for tenure track faculty members, peer recognition within and outside of the university remains important. Exceptional, sustained contribution of service to the school and/or university is the hallmark of this recognition.
V. DOCUMENTING SCHOLARSHIP IN THE NOMINATION PACKET

Nominees for appointment, promotion, or tenure in the SOM should keep in mind that the members of the APT Committee collectively have broad experience in academic medicine and deep knowledge in their respective fields but may not have deep understanding of the research, education, or clinical domain in which the candidate functions. APT members from the candidate’s department do not participate in the discussion or decision-making. It is therefore essential that the packet not only illuminates the candidate’s accomplishments but also provides adequate context to allow the committee to understand the candidate’s accomplishments, contributions, and impact.

A. Components of the Nomination Packet

Essential components of the packet include:

1. A 1-2 page cover letter from the candidate (not required for new appointments to the SOM);²

2. A letter of nomination from the department chair;³

3. A supporting letter from each chair of a department in which the candidate holds a secondary appointment (if applicable);²

4. A letter from the departmental APT Committee (or its equivalent) summarizing their deliberations of the candidate’s packet;²

5. A current curriculum vitae in UTMB format;⁴

6. Three or more internal letters from members of the UTMB community (not required for new appointments to the SOM)⁵

7. Three or more external letters;⁴

8. Three to five of the candidate’s publications (in electronic format);

9. An Educator Portfolio if education is a mission of excellence for the candidate;³

10. A Clinician Portfolio if clinical work is a mission of excellence for the candidate.

B. The Department APT Process

Each Department must have an APT Committee, consisting of departmental faculty members. The method of selection will be determined by the Chair of that Department. The Chair of smaller Departments with too few qualified faculty members to constitute a committee should consult with the Dean’s ex officio representative to the SOM APT Committee to identify alternatives. It is

² Guidance available on the Faculty Affairs website: http://www.utmb.edu/facultyaffairs/default.asp
³ See section VI(B) regarding Department APT process
⁴ Template available on the Faculty Affairs website: http://www.utmb.edu/facultyaffairs/default.asp
⁵ See section VI© regarding letters
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recommended that the Department APT committee be an independent faculty committee and be presided over by one of its members, and not the Department Chair. It is further recommended that the Chair be consulted by the Committee to get his/her input on the promotion, but that the Committee’s further deliberations and vote on recommendation not be attended by the Department Chair. This will allow maximal autonomy and confidentiality of peer deliberations, and promote confidentiality regarding the discussion. The Committee serves in an advisory role to the Chair; thus, a summary of the opinion of the Committee will be provided to the Chair in an advisory letter which will become part of the candidate’s packet should the nomination move forward. The Department Chair then makes the final decision about whether to present a candidate for promotion to the School of Medicine APT committee.

Many Department APT Guidelines are more stringent than the overall SOM requirements. Departments should maintain autonomy in setting their own requirement levels which may be more rigorous.

C. Letters

Letters from qualified members of the UTMB community and the larger academic community in which the candidate functions are essential in evaluating the candidate’s scholarly achievements and value to the university.

1. **Internal Letters:** Internal letters from at least three members of the UTMB community are required for current SOM faculty members who are nominated for promotion or tenure, but not for new faculty appointments. These letters should come from members of the faculty or administration who are in a position to evaluate the candidate’s contributions and impact.

2. **External Letters:** External Letters from individuals at the regional, national, or international level are required for all candidates and play an important role in assessing the extent of the candidate’s contributions, impact, and reputation. Requests for external letters should be accompanied by a set of these guidelines.

   a. **Tenure Track** – At least five letters from recognized experts at other institutions must be submitted. These letters must come from individuals of equal or higher academic rank than the rank requested for the candidate. To verify the appropriateness of international letter writers under a different system of academic titles, the Dean’s *ex officio* representative to the APT Committee should be consulted in advance. At least three of the external letters should be letters of evaluation—not merely letters of support—and may not come from current or former collaborators, mentors, or mentees of the candidate. Such letters should be from experts in the candidate’s field who can attest to the quality of their work.

   b. **Non-Tenure Track** – at least three letters from qualified peers must be submitted. The credentials of a “qualified peer” will vary depending on the candidate’s field and type of work (clinical, education, research, community service). In all cases, letters should come only from individuals who are
well-positioned to comment on the quality and impact of the candidate’s activities. The letters should clearly describe the professional relationship with the candidate as a basis for the comments provided.

D. Reprints

An electronic version of at least three—but no more than five—journal articles should be submitted with the packet as examples of the candidate’s scholarly work.

VI. OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR THE SOM APT COMMITTEE

The Departmental Chair ordinarily presents the candidate for appointment to, or promotion in, the Faculty of Medicine to the Dean of Medicine, who will transmit the proposal to the SOM APT Committee. The proposal must include objective evidence of reasons for proposing appointment, promotion, or tenure of the candidate, consistent with these “Guidelines for Establishing Rank and Tenure.”

The APT Committee will consist of 12 tenured Professors, each with one vote except the Chair, who will vote only in case of a tie. Four members shall be appointed each year for a three-year term (initial appointments shall be for one, two, or three years). Should vacancies occur, additional faculty members will be appointed to serve the unexpired terms. Members shall be appointed by the Dean. The membership shall consist of at least five basic scientists and five clinical scientists. Departmental Chairs may not be members. The immediate past members of the committee shall serve as voting reserve members, in the event that a voting quorum cannot be achieved for a scheduled meeting. Voting reserve members will not be assigned packets to review and present to the committee, but will attend meetings, where needed, to participate in the deliberations about the candidates and vote. The committee will elect a chair and a vice chair annually. Faculty members may serve on the committee for no more than three of each six consecutive years. The membership shall be published annually.

The APT Committee will serve in an advisory capacity to the Executive Committee. Its role is to evaluate the credentials and qualifications of each member who is proposed for appointment, promotion, or tenure. The APT Committee shall have a defined operating procedure as follows: Two members of the committee (the primary and secondary reviewers) will be assigned to each candidate. These two reviewers are responsible for analyzing critically the candidate’s qualifications and letters of evaluation from outside individuals, and for reporting to the APT Committee. The APT Committee will vote on each candidate and report their findings and recommendations in writing and in detail to the Dean of Medicine (Chair of the Executive Committee). These findings will be made available to the Executive Committee not less than 24 hours prior to consideration by that body.

An APT member shall not be in attendance during consideration of the appointment, promotion, or tenure of a faculty member in his or her primary department. A committee member will similarly be recused if there is significant conflict of interest such as close collaboration or family relationship. An APT committee member from a department in which the considered faculty member has a secondary appointment need not be recused.
The Department Chair of the proposed candidate shall be notified by the Dean or his/her designee of the action by the APT Committee and shall be informed of the reasons for any adverse action.

All recommendations for promotion or appointment to a position of Associate Professor or Professor, and all recommendations for the granting of tenure on the Faculty of Medicine, shall be approved or disapproved by the Executive Committee. A two thirds majority of those present but not less than a simple majority of the whole Executive Committee shall be required to override a recommendation of the APT Committee. After presentation of the proposed candidate to the Executive Committee, the Chair of the proposed candidate shall not be in attendance for discussion or vote. A report of the actions of the Executive Committee on the recommendations of the APT Committee shall be reported to the APT Committee.

The Academic Planning and Policy Committee, as a standing committee of the Faculty of Medicine, shall review and report on the guidelines and operating procedures. Their suggestions for guideline and operating procedure changes shall be brought before the SOM Faculty for approval.

VII. OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR THE APPEALS PROCESS FOR PROMOTION & TENURE

A. Appeal of a Department APT Committee Decision

A decision reached at the level of the department not to nominate a candidate for consideration for promotion and tenure by the SOM APT Committee may be appealed to the Dean of the School or the Dean's designee. Appeals must be in writing with a statement describing the grounds for the appeal not more than three months after the official date of the decision at the departmental level.

B. Appeal of a SOM APT Committee Decision

If the SOM APT Committee rejects a Department’s proposal for promotion or tenure, the candidate’s Department Chair may appeal to the SOM APT Committee for reconsideration. If the SOM APT Committee’s decision on rehearing remains adverse, the chair may appeal the Committee’s decision to the SOM Executive Committee. The appeals process may also bypass the School of Medicine APT Committee, directly to the Executive Committee. During an appeal to the Executive Committee, the Chair of the APT Committee will present the Committee’s reasons for the negative vote, answer any questions that the members of the Executive Committee may have, and will then be excused. The Department Chair may make additional remarks or answer questions from members of the Executive Committee, and will then be excused. The Executive Committee will then hold further discussion and a vote on the appeal.

If a faculty member contends that an unfavorable decision at any stage of the process has been reached for unlawful reasons, the faculty member should file a complaint with UTMB’s Department of Internal Investigations to initiate an investigation of the allegations.