

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

Alvarez College of Business

The Alvarez College of Business (ACOB) seeks to identify, recruit, and retain exemplary faculty across its seven academic departments. As a top research college within a Carnegie R1 institution, it seeks to provide clear promotion and tenure guidance that is aligned and commensurate with UTSA's strategic vision as a great public, urban, Hispanic-serving research university.

The guidance below seeks to value and recognize the pivotal role of faculty in our interconnected, mutually supportive institutional goals of excellent research, teaching, service and innovation. Accordingly, and fundamental to our college' and university's mission, successful applicants for tenure and promotion should display the attributes as outlined below. Importantly, as departments (DFRAC) and college (CFRAC) review committees apply the guidance, they should be mindful that a holistic approach to tenure and promotion is required. Therefore, within workload dimensions, review committees need to exercise sound professional judgement and be mindful that multiple tracks exist to earn tenure and/or promotion and that those tracks may vary significantly depending on the faculty member's discipline.

Review committees, equipped with their own discipline-based practices, should evaluate every applicant holistically, while adhering to the guidance provided below. Moreover, review committees should be mindful of the window over which faculty are evaluated, given discipline-based standards (e.g., care must be exercised as the window to measure impact can vary depending on the length of time since an applicant's attainment of the terminal degree). Finally, when considering faculty going from associate to full professor, review committees need to evaluate applicants in a commensurate and holistic manner.

Against this background, we organize the rest of the document in three sections. We first provide guidance regarding research-based activities, followed by non-research activities (i.e., teaching, service). We conclude with general guidance regarding the consideration of prior work, and promotion from associate to full professor.

1. Guidance on research-based activities

Pursuing research excellence is of critical importance for faculty members at the ACOB. Our faculty engage in researching the nature of the business world and the human interactions that naturally occur in economic and social transactions. Applicants going up for promotion and tenure should demonstrate that they have generated significant and impactful scholarly contributions by including clear discussion and supporting evidence around each of the items below:

Scholarly contributions and impact. Keeping in mind discipline-based differences, scholarly contributions by applicants should be evaluated by weighing the quality and quantity of peer-reviewed publications, research reports, leading conference presentations and proceedings, books, and/or the number and magnitude of sponsored grants, or similar contractual awards. Moreover,

contributions toward the financing, mentoring, and intellectual development of doctoral students should be taken into account in departments with such programs.

Applicants should demonstrate that their contributions are significant to their specific discipline. Desirable metrics measuring the quality and impact of the contributions include, but are not limited to, reliable, externally-validated peer-reviewed journal rankings well recognized in the discipline, impact factors, manuscript citations and downloads, intra and extra-mural research awards (e.g., best paper award at a conference), and the number and dollar amount of grants received. Other forms of complementary impacts may include mentions or summaries in the business or popular press (e.g., *The Economist*, *Wall Street Journal*, etc.), citations in textbooks in use, citations in legislative briefs/deliberations, and translation of research technologies that lead to patents, commercialized technologies (e.g., software, applications), or the like. While valuable, these types of complementary practitioner-oriented forms of impacts are insufficient on their own. Review committees should not assess contributions solely on the count but rather on a holistic review of the contribution quality, given the respective discipline-based practices and benchmarks.

Dissemination. Scholarship by the faculty member should have broad dissemination in leading venues (e.g., peer-reviewed journals, high quality conferences, showcases) of scholarly contributions appropriate for their discipline. The applicant should show evidence of publications, presentations, exhibitions, reviews, or proceedings, extending to scholarly communities nationally and internationally. Additionally, when applicable and consistent with discipline-based expectations, applicants might show authoring of textbooks, national society presentations, presentations and proceedings in high quality conferences, externally-sponsored grants presentations at funding agencies, to name a few.

Independence. Applicants' work submitted as a part of the evaluation should reflect ideas and concepts developed by the applicant, distinct and distinguishable from those of mentors, advisors, or collaborators. Applicants going up for tenure are encouraged to demonstrate their independent and incremental contributions in the package submitted. For example, in some cases, applicants may highlight solo-authored projects, while in other cases they may articulate first authorship in the manuscript. Yet other applicants may emphasize the primary contribution they made to the project. In disciplines where solo-authored papers or first authorship is uncommon, the applicants should provide a written description of their contribution towards the study, grant or scholarly activity. The applicant should demonstrate and document independent contribution consistent with discipline-based expectations.

Progressive record of achievement and innovation. Academic efforts and outcomes should build and unfold, showing evidence of ongoing development of expertise, skills, and accomplishments. Applicants should clearly articulate how their achievements and innovations have the potential to shape the thinking of scholars or practitioners through novel lines of scholarship. Applicants should also provide evidence that their research efforts will continue in the near future (e.g., they have a deep pipeline) and where and when they expect their efforts to pay off (e.g., provide tentative target journals and dates for milestones and/or publications).

Benefit and societal impact. Applicants should show that their scholarly efforts have positively affected others in their department, college, and academy. For example, mentoring PhD, masters,

or undergraduate students pursuing research is an important, yet time-consuming scholarly task. Applicants should provide evidence that they have been personally involved in the training, mentoring and development of students, whether in the production of scholarship or in activities that model the excitement of intellectual engagement to promote lifelong learning. In addition, applicants should demonstrate their scholarly contributions to the academy in roles such as editors, evaluative reviewers, discussants, or moderators at major conferences and symposia.

2. Guidance on non-research-based activities

Teaching

Teaching and instructional activities are critical contributions by faculty members at the ACOB. Whether they teach undergraduate, master's, or PhD students, applicants going up for tenure and/or promotion should articulate/demonstrate how they pursue teaching excellence. Review committees must be mindful that their recommendations in this area should be based on a holistic review of teaching excellence beyond teaching evaluations and the number of students taught. An applicant's package should include a clear discussion and supporting evidence around each of the following items below.

Pedagogical contributions, innovation and impact. Pedagogical contributions by applicants should be evaluated by taking into consideration the number and type of courses taught, class sizes, and innovations made to increase teaching effectiveness. Desirable metrics measuring the quality and impact of the pedagogical contribution include, but are not limited to, the difficulty of subject matter, coverage of all the materials in the course description, the number of students taught, as well as student evaluation and peer observation. Other examples of impact include the number of courses developed/designed, the number of course preparations, the number and type of tools and assignments developed/designed, the level of students taught (undergraduate, graduate, and/or PhD) and the level of difficulty of the course. In addition, applicants should articulate and provide evidence of how applying pedagogies, such as a flipped classroom, online delivery, redesigning of curriculum or assignments, and video tutoring production, measurably improved student learning and success.

Review committees should not evaluate pedagogical contributions solely on student evaluations or similar metrics but rather on a holistic review of the depth and significance of the contributions, given the discipline-based practices and benchmarks.

Dissemination and adoption. Unlike scholarly outputs, which naturally are required to undergo blind-peer review, pedagogical outputs traditionally do not undergo peer review, unless they are textbooks. Applicants should seek observation by peers from the home department. If applicable, the applicant should show evidence of pedagogical publications, presentations, exhibitions, proceedings, or awards showing that their pedagogical materials are being disseminated, adopted and/or recognized. In some cases, the adoption of a course and/or materials can be internal. For example, if the applicant is the main designer of a course with multiple sections, a case can be made that leading the design and maintenance of relevant materials is of great value to the department.

Independence. Applicant's work submitted as a part of the evaluation should reflect pedagogical ideas and innovations developed by the applicant. Applicants going up for tenure are encouraged to demonstrate how their independent and incremental contributions are reflected in the package submitted. For example, in some cases, applicants may highlight the independent design of a new course, assignment, or modality within a course. The way the applicant approaches independent contribution should be consistent with discipline-based expectations.

Progressive record of achievement. Pedagogical efforts and outcomes should build and unfold, showing evidence of ongoing development of expertise, skills and mastery of subject matter. Applicants should also provide evidence that their teaching efforts are likely to continue in the foreseeable future (e.g., they will continue to maintain relevancy of the pedagogical materials to keep up with labor market expectations).

Benefit. Applicants should show that their academic efforts and outcomes provide recognizable value. For example, applicants should show how they have influenced PhD, master's or undergraduate students, particularly those from underrepresented groups. For example, the applicant should provide evidence that they have been personally involved in the training, mentoring and development of students, whether in the production of scholarship, in the design of activities that model the excitement of intellectual engagement to promote lifelong learning, in the uses of new pedagogical techniques leading to improved classroom outcomes, or in the provision of service to the discipline by serving as a master teacher.

Service and Citizenship

Engaging in service activities is a critical contribution by faculty members at the ACOB. Whether they are involved in department, college or university-level service engagements, applicants going up for tenure and/or promotion should demonstrate how they provide service and are a contributing citizen to the college, academia and community (society). Department and college-level review committees must be mindful that their recommendations in this area should be based on a holistic review of service engagement that goes beyond counting the number of committees an applicant sits on. An applicant's package should include clear discussion and supporting evidence around each of the following items:

Service contributions and engagement. Applicants should provide evidence of meaningful service engagements including, but not limited to, contributing to department, college and university committees, mentoring student organizations, and leading conference organization to name a few. Applicants should discuss the number and type of committees they served on and their contributions towards the fulfillment of each committee's work. Applicants should also include evidence of advising student organizations, mentoring students, or serving on committees that directly or indirectly impact students (e.g., undergraduate program committee, ad hoc committees). Applicants should also provide evidence of serving in roles that support the department (e.g., recruiting committee), college (e.g., program committee), university, funding agency (e.g., grant reviewer), academic society and relevant journals (e.g., as a reviewer or an editor/associate editor), to name a few.

Academic citizenship and ambassador for the college. Applicants should provide evidence that they are contributing citizens of their department and strong advocates and ambassadors of the college. The service orientation and contributions by the faculty member should measurably improve the department, college, and university. Examples of academic citizenship include, but are not limited to, consistently attending and participating in research workshops, providing friendly feedback on manuscripts to colleagues, adopting additional course preparations, adjusting class schedules to serve student needs, among others. Externally, when representing the college, applicants should demonstrate how their involvement in committees, taskforces, and academic organizations enriches and improves the reputation of the college. Review committees should evaluate whether the applicants' service efforts reflect those of an engaged and diligent citizen.

3. Other Important Considerations

Consideration of prior work. Seasoned tenure-track applicants who join the college after spending years-in-rank at other institutions should clearly articulate their discipline-specific accomplishments since joining the ACOB. Such accomplishments at UTSA are expected. Review committees shall exercise sound professional judgement when evaluating (and giving credit for) work attained at other institutions, in relation to their accomplishments since arriving to the college.

Promotion to full professor. Applicants seeking promotion to full professor should continue to adhere to the guidelines for achievement required for promotion to associate professor with tenure and should meet additional standards that demonstrate the applicant's reputation as a respected independent scholar. First, applicants should possess distinctive reputations as scholars who produce research that meets or surpasses a threshold of research quality and impact expected for promotion to full professor at comparable research universities. Applicants should also hold significant positions of intellectual leadership within a particular academic community on a national and international level. Applicants should also demonstrate significant leadership and mentoring of PhD students and junior faculty. Chairing dissertations, sitting on dissertation committees, and co-authoring major publications with PhD students and junior faculty are important ways to show this type of leadership. Second, applicants should be devoted and accomplished teachers who advance student success, and who demonstrate a commitment to innovative teaching techniques across educational and difficulty levels. Third, applicants should demonstrate an unwavering commitment to service to the department, college, university and the academy as a whole. Desirable metrics associated with these guidelines are inclusive of those for applicants going from assistant to associate professor with tenure, but should additionally clearly demonstrate the applicant's reputation as a nationally/internationally recognized independent scholar. Applicant's packages should be commensurate with discipline-specific benchmarks.

Reference Links/Documents:

<https://provost.utsa.edu/faculty-review/promotion-tenure/criteria.html>