

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO  
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES  
2008-2009

PART I

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The Office of Faculty Affairs sponsors a workshop each Spring to facilitate discussion among executive officers and faculty of the issues that affect faculty development. All probationary faculty and others who will seek promotion are strongly advised to attend.

All requests for further information and explanation regarding these documents should be directed to Michele Mancione, Room 2731 UH, M/C 103. Her e-mail address is [michelem@uic.edu](mailto:michelem@uic.edu) or you may contact her by telephone at extension 3-7636. This set of Policies, Procedures, and Forms can be found at: <http://www.uic.edu/depts/oa/pt.html>

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Section 1</b>	ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF CASES	3
<b>Section 2</b>	EVALUATIONS PRIOR TO PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW	3
	A. MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEWS FOR TENURE TRACK	3
	B. NON-RENTENTION PRIOR TO THE SIXTH YEAR	3
	C. REVIEW OF FACULTY ON NON-TENURE TRACKS	4
	D. TRACK SWITCHING	4
	E. ROLLBACKS	4
<b>Section 3</b>	THE PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW	5
	A. USE OF THE FORMS IN PART IV	5
	B. JOINT APPOINTMENTS	5
	C. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS (NON-SALARIED/ADJUNCT APPOINTMENTS	5
	D. PROMOTION IN THE APPROPRIATE TRACK	6
	E. NON-RETENTION IN YEAR 6 OF THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD OR IN THE FINAL YEAR OF A Q CONTRACT	6
	F. VOTING RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES	7
	E. COMMUNICATION OF REOMMENDATIONS TO THE CANDIDATE	8
	F. NEW INFORMATION	9
<b>Section 4</b>	DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN P&T REVIEWS	10
<b>Section 5</b>	COLLEGE-LEVEL REVIEWS	14
	A. COLLEGES NOT ORGANIZED BY DEPARTMENTS	14
	B. LINE COLLEGE REVIEW	14
<b>Section 6</b>	REVIEWS BEYOND THE LINE COLLEGE	14
<b>Section 7</b>	RECONSIDERATION AND APPEALS OF NEGATIVE DECISIONS	15
<b>Section 8</b>	EXCLUSIONS	15
<b>Section 9</b>	NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE DELIBERATIONS	16

## Section 1

### ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF CASES

By Monday, October 13, 2008, each Dean must send to the Office of Academic Affairs a list of all mid-probationary reviews and promotion and tenure (P&T) cases to be considered in the current academic year, including any that may lead to non-retention.

Included as a separate document in PART IV FORMS is a document labeled "Expected Promotion and Tenure Reviews 2008-2009". This file contains three forms entitled, "Mid-Probationary", "Research and Clinical Non-Tenure Track", and "Academic (Research and Clinical) Tenure Track." When completed, these lists should include both personnel actions in the tenure and non-tenure tracks, as well as mid-probationary reviews. The candidate's name, UIN number, department(s) (including joint or courtesy appointments, where applicable), the proposed personnel action (mid-probationary review, promotion, promotion and tenure, tenure in rank, non-retention), name of paper preparer\*, and, in the case of probationary faculty, the individual's year of service/tenure code should be included. Remember that review and action is **required** in cases which are labeled as tenure-code 6 in AY 2008-09.

\*The paper preparer is the faculty member or departmental executive officer who signs on the cover page, **not** the staff member who has responsibility for physical production of the papers. See Section 4.

## Section 2

### EVALUATIONS PRIOR TO PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

#### A. MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEWS FOR TRACK TENURE TRACK

Campus policy requires that a formal, internal review of faculty on probationary contracts take place **no later** than the mid-point of a faculty member's probationary period on the tenure track at UIC, unless a decision not to retain is reached at the level of the recommending unit before the time a formal review would be scheduled. For most probationary faculty, this review will occur in their third year at UIC. **A copy of the mid-probationary review will also need to be included later in the tenure review P&T packet.** Detailed instructions for processing mid-probation reviews are in a separate memo and can be found online at: <http://www.uic.edu/depts/oa/pt.html>

For faculty with joint appointments, mid-probationary reviews should be carried out in both/all units.

#### B. NON-RETENTION PRIOR TO THE TENURE-CODE 6 YEAR

An unfavorable review prior to the 6<sup>th</sup> year may result in the issuance of a terminal contract for the following academic year. The unit advisory/executive committee should be consulted by the unit executive officer when considering issuing a terminal contract. In any cases in which you contemplate non-retention, please contact University Counsel. Since a full six-year probationary period is not guaranteed, non-retention may be recommended at any time during the tenure-code 1 through tenure-code 5 years, with a terminal contract given for the following year. (Statutes: Article X, Section 1b [6]). Notification to a candidate by the Board of Trustees prior to March 1 during the first year of the candidate's probationary period is sufficient

to terminate his or her service at the end of the contract year with no obligation of an additional terminal year (Statutes: Article X, Section 1b [4]).

Formal notice of non-renewal is issued by the Board of Trustees after the executive officer informs Faculty Affairs. (Please note that at tenure code "1", a terminated employee is not accorded an extra year if notified by the Board of Trustees by March 1).

There are no special forms for notice of non-retention prior to the tenure code 6 year. A written notice of non-retention to candidates and submission of a Personnel Information Transmittal Report (PITR) are sufficient in such cases. Within one week of recommendation of non-retention by the executive officer, the faculty member may respond with a written resignation effective at the end of their current contract; otherwise for tenure track faculty, a terminal contract must be issued for the following year.

#### C. REVIEW OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

It is in the interests of both the faculty member and the department, that faculty who are eligible for consideration for promotion should be reviewed at the department level, at least three years prior to the time of the anticipated university review.

#### D. TRACK SWITCHING

An evaluation of the appropriate track for the probationary faculty member should be an important element of the mid-probationary review. During an annual review or the mid-probationary review, a tenure-track faculty member or the faculty member and his/her department head may decide that a change in tenure track is desirable. A "track switch" may occur if it is determined that the tenure-track probationary faculty member's commitment to the University has changed substantially or their career direction has changed. Should a switch be desirable, it should occur no later than upon completion of year four of the probationary period. Requests for track switching should originate with the faculty member, endorsed by the department head and dean and approved by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Years.

#### E. ROLLBACKS

An interruption of the probationary period (rollback in the tenure year code) may be granted for one year upon request when an event or compelling circumstances cause substantial impairment of a candidate's ability to pursue his or her teaching, scholarly activities, and/or service. Examples for situations where rollbacks may be granted include: disability or extended and/or severe personal illness; compelling obligations to a member of the family or household that requires significant time away from University duties; circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member, such as grave administrative error. In the event of the birth or adoption of a child under six years old, an automatic hold will be given upon the faculty member's notification to the unit executive officer.

The candidate's record before the event must be consistent with the preservation of institutional quality. The guiding principle is that the candidate is making appropriate, demonstrable progress toward attaining indefinite tenure. Requests for rollbacks should be initiated in writing by the faculty member, endorsed by the appropriate unit executive officer and dean, and submitted for approval by the Provost and the Chancellor.

At all stages of the tenure review process it must be emphasized that reviewers should evaluate the scholarship since the previous personnel action and NOT the number of calendar years. In addition, the reason for the tenure rollback should not be discussed.

### Section 3

#### THE PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

##### A. USE OF THE FORMS IN PART IV

The forms in PART IV are used for positive or negative recommendations for promotion and/or tenure. Within one week (seven calendar days) of a negative vote and recommendation, faculty in tenure code 6 may respond with a written resignation effective at the end of their 6<sup>th</sup> year contract or be issued a terminal contract for the following academic year. Faculty on Q contracts may continue to work until the end of their current contract. In both cases, (T6 or Q) if the candidate chooses, the papers need not go on to the next level of review. Copies of resignation letters must be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs. (See also Section 4, D).

Any other unusual scenarios should be discussed with the Office of Faculty Affairs, 3-3470 or with Michele Mancione, 3-7636.

In proposing and reviewing the promotion of faculty members, in the words of the Statutes, "special consideration" shall be given to the following:

- (1) teaching ability and performance
- (2) research ability, creative activity, and achievement
- (3) ability and performance in continuing education, public service, committee work, and special assignments designed to promote the quality and effectiveness of academic programs and services." (See Article IX, Section 3e.).

Indicators of the quality of publishing outlets should be provided where appropriate. Thus, citation measures of the work, indicators of journal impact, and press reputations should be included in the papers. If given enough time, the library staff can be very helpful in identifying such material.

##### B. JOINT APPOINTMENTS

For appointments split between two or more units, the appropriate faculty committee in both/all units should vote independently to recommend promotion and/or tenure in their respective units, and the department executive officers of both/all units should complete the Executive Officer's Evaluation (V.F. in the standard P&T packet). The external referees should be chosen by mutual discussion and agreement between the two or more department executive officers.

##### C. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS (NON-SALARIED/ADJUNCT APPOINTMENTS)

Although no formal review is required, a letter should be included from the department executive officer giving support to the promotion with a continued courtesy appointment. The letter can be brief and should be in the format of the department executive officer's letter of justification in the standard P&T papers. It can be inserted after the Executive Officer's Evaluation (V. F. in the standard P&T packet).

D. PROMOTION IN THE APPROPRIATE TRACK

**The campus does not normally permit candidates to be promoted in a track unless they have been in that track for at least 2 years, and promotions may take place only within the track of the appointment.** For example, Clinical Assistant Professors may be promoted to Clinical Associate Professors, Assistant Professors of Clinical Medicine may be promoted to Associate Professors of Clinical Medicine, and Assistant Professors may be promoted to Associate Professors, but Clinical Assistant Professors **may not** be promoted to Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors **may not** be promoted to Clinical Associate Professors.

E. NON-RETENTION IN YEAR 6 OF THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD OR IN THE FINAL YEAR OF A Q CONTRACT

If the unit determines that a faculty member in Year 6 of the probationary period should not be recommended for indefinite tenure and promotion, the University of Illinois Statutes require that a Notice of Nonreappointment be given and be accompanied by an offer of a terminal contract for the following academic year. So that this notice may be issued by the Secretary of the Board of Trustees by August 16 of the year preceding the termination date, units are asked to notify faculty members, if possible, no later than May 15 that Notice of Nonreappointment is being recommended and that a terminal contract will be offered.

For Associate Professors and Professors who have a “Q” appointment (an initial term appointment for a specified period of time at the advanced rank, but without tenure), units should take one of the following actions in the **final** year of the contract.

1. The faculty member may be recommended for indefinite tenure at the current rank or with a promotion.
2. If a review indicates that the scholarly record does not warrant indefinite tenure, then the unit should notify the faculty member in writing as soon as possible that he/she will not be recommended for tenure and that the current/final year of their contract will end and they will not be reappointed. The University of Illinois Statutes, for Associate Professors and Professors on “Q” appointments, do not require that the faculty member receive a one-year Notice of Nonreappointment if not being recommended for indefinite tenure.
3. Under unusual circumstances, the unit may submit a request for an extension of the term appointment. This request should be submitted through the appropriate channels to the Provost.

There are no special forms for notice of non-retention either prior to the tenure code 6 year or for the final year of a Q contract. A written notice of non-retention to candidates and submission of a Personnel Information Transmittal Report (PITR) are sufficient in such cases. Within one week of recommendation of non-retention by the executive officer, the faculty member may respond with a written resignation effective prior to but not later than the end of their current contract; otherwise, for tenure track faculty, a terminal contract must be issued for the following year. Faculty on a Q contract will be terminated at the end of the contract year in which they are given notice.

## F. VOTING RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES

The University of Illinois Statutes (Part II., Section 3, Para.a.1.), includes as faculty those members of the academic staff in that unit with the rank or title of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor, who are tenured or receiving probationary credit toward tenure and those administrators in the direct line of responsibility for academic affairs (persons who hold the title director or dean in an academic unit, provost, chancellor and president). Administrative staff not in the direct line of responsibility for academic affairs are members of the faculty only if they also hold faculty appointments. Regarding the voting rights of the faculty, the Statutes continue: "The bylaws of any academic unit may further mandate a minimum percent faculty appointment in that unit for specified faculty privileges, such as voting privileges."

A faculty member or administrator must ordinarily be tenured for some percentage of time in an academic unit in order to have promotion and tenure voting privileges in that unit. The unit, department or college, may further restrict such voting privileges to those tenured at or above some specified percentage of time, e.g., 50 percent, but this must be specified in the unit bylaws. The Statutes (Article II., Section 3, Par., a(2)) allow that bylaws may grant specified faculty privileges to other teaching staff, e.g., to Clinical Professors. When special circumstances in a particular unit provide good reasons for allowing other senior professors a vote on P&T advisory committees, the college may petition the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs to allow such exceptional procedures.

Eligible voters must further satisfy the following conditions:

**Rank: Only faculty at rank(s) above the current rank of the candidate may vote at any level in the promotion and tenure process.** Thus, only full professors may vote on the promotion of an associate professor to the rank of full professor, and only associate and full professors may vote on the promotion of an assistant professor to the rank of associate professor. Some colleges may wish to include in their bylaws, or P&T document, a provision which allows non-tenured senior faculty to vote on the award of rank, but in such instances only faculty holding tenure are eligible to vote on the granting of tenure. (Where separate votes on the award of tenure and the award of rank are held, the promotion and tenure papers must record these separate votes). College P&T documents and the rules of campus committees may permit department members who are ineligible to vote in general, or in a particular case, to participate in promotion and tenure discussions.

**Lowest Level: Eligible voters on particular promotion and tenure cases may only vote at one level of the review process. This vote must be cast at the EARLIEST level of review in which the voter can participate. Failure to vote at this lowest level requires that the voter forego voting at subsequent levels.** Thus, a faculty member in a department who also serves on a college executive or promotion committee must vote at the department level. A faculty member who serves on both a line college committee and the Campus P&T Committee must vote in the line college. Such individuals should be listed as "ineligible" in the vote record of the subsequent committees on which they serve.

*Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees:* Departmental bylaws, or other document covering P&T policies and procedures, may establish a promotion and tenure

committee, consisting of some subset of the tenured faculty, to review and vote on promotion and tenure cases. This is typically done in very large departments. In small units, with fewer than three eligible voters, according to the rules outlined above, the dean, with appropriate advice, may establish a promotion and tenure committee including faculty from other UIC units who are qualified by expertise and meet all other eligibility standards.

*Deans, Directors, Department Executive Officers, and Chairs:* Department executive officers, and deans, are eligible to participate in discussion; however, because they provide independent judgment, they do not vote within their units. The role of department executive officers and deans is to take the votes of the relevant committees under advisement when presenting their independent recommendations, with accompanying rationales. Executive Officers shall normally present the rationale for the departmental recommendation.

If there is disagreement between the department P&T committee and the executive officer, the departmental P&T committee may submit a separate letter addressing the basis of their vote. **If there is a split vote, the reason must be addressed in the letter of the unit head or in a letter from the department committee.**

*Family Members:* Article IX, Section 2, of the Statutes prohibits faculty from participating "...in institutional decisions involving a direct benefit... to a member of his immediate family." Promotion decisions are explicitly identified as falling under this prohibition, and "immediate family" is further defined to include "spouse, ancestors, and descendants, all descendants of the individual's grandparents, and the spouse of any of the foregoing."

*Voting in Absentia:* Voting *in absentia* is not (usually) permitted at the college level. Voting *in absentia*, while not encouraged, is permitted at the departmental level, provided the department bylaws state that only those who are closely familiar with the work of a given candidate, and familiar with the expectations and norms of the department and college, are given the privilege of voting *in absentia*. Otherwise, only faculty present (in person or via teleconferencing) during discussion of the merit of a given candidate's work are eligible to vote. In units that do not have departmental structure and the first level of voting is at the college level, the conditions above apply to the college.

#### G. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CANDIDATE

The votes of any review committees and the recommendations of the Executive Officer, Dean, Campus P&T Committee, Dean of the Graduate College, and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs must be communicated to the candidate promptly and in writing at each stage of the review process. Therefore, during the P&T cycle notifications would be as follows:

- Department Vote – communicated to candidate by the Executive Officer.
- College Vote – communicated to candidate by the Dean with copy to Executive Officer(s).
- Campus P&T Committee vote – communicated to the candidate by the Dean with copy of Executive Officer(s).
- Provost's and Graduate College Dean's recommendations – communicated to the candidate by the Dean with copy to Executive Officer(s).

Following the review process, the Chancellor's decision is sent directly to the candidate with copies to the Dean and Executive Officer(s).

*De-Briefing Opportunities:* The candidate is entitled to a brief, orally-rendered

explanation from his or her executive officer of the rationale for endorsement or non-endorsement at each level of review. Because all levels of review prior to the Chancellor are recommendations, such explanations should be framed with sufficient generality so as not to invite detailed rejoinder or debate.

For cases that go through all levels of review, the final orally rendered debriefing is the responsibility of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. If papers are withdrawn

earlier, the office at the highest level of review (e.g., department, or line college), is responsible for final oral debriefing. All such debriefings must preserve confidentiality with respect to the identity of the referees and the participants in any discussion.

*Withdrawal from the Review Process:* Any candidate is entitled to stop the review process at any time by **submitting a letter** to their department executive officer

A candidate in their sixth year or in their final year of a Q contract, upon receipt of a negative vote and recommendation from either the department or the line college, is allowed **one week (seven calendar days)** to withdraw his or her papers and submit a written waiver of review and a resignation before the papers are forwarded to the next level for review. T-6 candidates can either elect to resign effective no later than August 15 of the current year or elect to have a one-year terminal contract for the following academic year issued by the Board of Trustees. For faculty on a Q contract, the resignation must be effective August 15 of the current contract year. Examples: 1) a departmental vote in November, 2008 for a candidate in their sixth year is negative, the candidate may elect to resign effective no later than August 15, 2009 or have a terminal contract issued by the Board of Trustees for the 2009-2010 academic year. 2) If a departmental vote in November, 2008 for a faculty member in their final year of a Q contract is negative, the candidate's resignation date can be no later than August 15, 2009.

The option of withdrawal without resignation, for example in case of proposed early promotion and tenure of probationary faculty or of proposed promotion from the rank of tenured associate professor to that of full professor, is likewise available to candidates in those categories. Such withdrawal may take place without prejudice to a *de novo* review in some future review cycle.

In summary, the candidate has **one week (seven calendar days)** to respond. If no response is received from the candidate, the papers will be forwarded to the next level for review.

#### H. NEW INFORMATION

Because of the length of the review process, it is possible that the candidate's record may improve significantly or that other information pertinent to a case may come to light during the course of the review. **If, in the judgment of the executive officer or other preparer of the promotion and tenure papers, new information could affect the outcome of the case, it should be submitted at any stage of the process by the preparer.** In the interest of time and consistency, the executive officer of the originating unit should formally transmit all such material directly to the level at which the case is currently under review, and to all intervening levels. Since information about grants awarded and publications accepted should have been foreshadowed in the papers with the modifiers such as "pending" or "under review," cases usually do not need to be reconsidered at prior stages

The office currently reviewing the case should incorporate this new material into the candidate's papers for submission to any further levels of review.

The need for the timely processing of a case, in addition to the fact that such new information normally becomes available at a more advanced point in the review process, will usually dictate that review of the new information will take place after a case has reached the Office of Academic Affairs. (Refer to Part III for correct submission procedure for submitting new information to the OVCAA).

## Section 4

### DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN P&T REVIEWS

A copy of the most recent document covering departmental P&T policies and procedures should be on file in the line college and in the Office of Academic Affairs. The line College should be notified whenever changes are made in the document and the College should inform Academic Affairs (See Attachment 1, November 3, 2008 deadline).

**Who Should Be Reviewed:** All tenure-code 6 faculty or faculty who are in the final year of a Q contract must undergo university review for promotion and tenure unless they are resigning. Executive officers should also, on a regular basis, invite all assistant and associate professors to a discussion of their academic credentials for the purpose of determining when a review for promotion and/or tenure would be appropriate.

**Joint Appointments:** For appointments split between two or more units, the appropriate faculty committees in both/all units should vote independently to recommend promotion and/or tenure in their respective units, and the department executive officers of both/all units should submit a letter of justification in the standard P&T packet. The external referees should be chosen by mutual discussion and agreement between the two or more department executive officers.

**Timetable:** Because external referees should be given ample time to properly evaluate a candidate's work, most departments find they need to begin preparing for P&T reviews (e.g., preliminary review of possible candidates' dossiers and the compilation of lists of appropriate referees) during the spring term prior to the year in which the university review would take place.

**Responsibility for the Case:** The executive officer takes responsibility for the preparation of the papers, unless the Dean assigns someone else the responsibility, as, for example, when the executive officer herself is the candidate. (Instructions for units not organized by departments are given in the next section). **By affixing his/her signature on the cover sheet, the paper preparer assumes full responsibility for the accuracy of the contents of the dossier. The definition of an executive officer is the head of the unit responsible for academic and personnel issues who reports directly to the dean of the unit's College/School. In order to be the paper preparer, the executive officer must be eligible to vote for the candidate. If the executive officer does not meet this requirement, a faculty member who meets the eligibility requirements must be appointed by either the executive officer of the unit or the dean.**

**Candidate's Responsibilities:** The candidate is responsible for furnishing to the executive officer the information which is requisite for completing the forms and forwarding the case, but does not determine the content and presentation of the case. **The candidate will review the factual elements of the papers and acknowledge this review with a signature on the cover sheet. The executive officer/paper preparer has final responsibility and authority for the**

## content and presentation of the papers.

**External Evaluation:** In evaluating a candidate's scholarship, the department should obtain a written evaluation from **not fewer than 5 but no more than 8** members of the relevant profession(s) or discipline(s) who have not had a close association with the candidate. The letters in this section are to be solicited by the executive officer, **not** by the candidate.

**Selection of Referees for the External Evaluation:** Because the choice of outside references is critical to evaluating the candidates, the following guidelines should be observed:

### Quality of Referees:

- Referees should be from strong departments at major research institutions, such as those typically found among Research I, AAU, or premier foreign institutions.
- All referees from universities must be full professors or equivalent (for example Readers at a British University) with outstanding scholarly accomplishment in the candidate's field.
- If referees are from industry or government, they should be of a similar stature to a full professor at a major research institution, and this should be justified in the papers.

Deviations from the above guidelines are permissible if a proper evaluation of the candidates work *would not otherwise be possible*. For example, if a candidate's field is so small that it will not be possible to find at least 5 referees satisfying the above criteria who have the expertise necessary to evaluate the candidate's work, if an Associate Professor is uniquely qualified to evaluate a candidate's work, or in situations where a faculty member is well known in the profession, it may be difficult to find leading scholars who do not have close ties with the candidate. Such deviations must be explained in detail. Simply saying "the field is too small" does not constitute a justification.

### Objectivity and Conflicts of Interest:

- Referees should be chosen so that they will provide, and be seen to provide, evaluations that are as objective as possible. They should not have served as thesis advisor of the candidate, nor have collaborated with the candidate, nor have some other past or current close relationship with the candidate that would interfere with their objective assessment of the case, or give them a stake in the outcome of the case. However, as noted above, letters from collaborators which address a candidate's contribution to a collaboration may be solicited by the unit executive officer and included in Section V.C. in the P&T papers.
- Knowledge of the candidate (e.g., having heard the candidate speak at conferences, or being familiar with the candidate's work) does not constitute a conflict of interest, and indeed is evidence of the candidate's visibility and impact.
- Candidates may submit a list of referees who they believe **are inappropriate**, along with the reasons for their proposed exclusion. Though such a list is not binding, the executive officer making the final choice should take the proposed exclusions into account. **Candidates are, however, not allowed to submit to the department a list of potential referees.**

In view of the need for objectivity in evaluating a candidate's work, deviations from the guidelines on conflicts will not be permitted.

### *The solicitation of referees*

It is recommended that this be done in two stages:

The first contact, which may be by e-mail, should inquire about the availability of the potential referee and willingness to serve, and must ask specifically whether the referee has been an advisor or collaborator with the candidate, or for any other reason might be seen as less than impartial. More than 8 potential referees may need to be contacted until a pool of at least 5 willing, objective, referees is assembled. **A list of all such contacts, with the responses (or lack thereof) is to be included with the papers.** Please see attached Sample A in Part III, Section 7B.

The second contact is the official letter. Please see attached Sample B in Part III, Section 7B.

*Information that should be sent to referees in the second letter:* All external referees should be sent copies of the candidate's updated curriculum vitae and a sample of recent publications (i.e., publications since the last personnel action) and work(s) in press. Where appropriate to the discipline, URL's for submissions to an electronic archive or online journal may be used instead of physical copies of the papers, if this is acceptable to the referee.

*Solicitation of Letters:* The solicitation of letters of evaluation should come from the executive officer or senior colleague who has been charged with preparing the documentation, never from the candidate. It should be clear that the purpose of the letter is to obtain a candid assessment of the candidate's scholarly accomplishments and standing in the field. Letters should indicate the rank for which the candidate is being considered and whether or not the award of tenure is involved. The tone of the letter should be neutral and should not indicate the desired outcome of the process. Solicitation letters to referees should **NOT** include language to suggest that the candidate can see the letters with the name and institution removed. Referees should be strongly encouraged to provide a critical evaluation and not merely summarize the candidate's c.v.

It is important to give adequate time for the referees to write their letters. Therefore, it is suggested that requests should be sent out as early as possible (e.g. by the end of May) in the year of consideration. All external evaluations of the nominee that were solicited by the department for the review must be included in the candidate's file even if the reviewer's letter is a simple statement of inability/unwillingness to review. Your solicitation letter should include the following (See Sample B, Part III, for full text):

*In your letter would you please,*

- ✓ *Note that you are evaluating the scholarship since the previous personnel action and not necessarily the number of calendar years. This is especially important in cases being reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor. Our campus has a tenure rollback policy that is granted on a case-by-case basis after review.*
- ✓ *Discuss the candidate's work in a critical fashion, commenting on the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarship.*
- ✓ *Comment on the volume of the candidate's scholarly activities relative to the standards in the field.*
- ✓ *Remark on the quality of the publishing outlets and the source of funding when such is not obvious.*

- ✓ *Estimate his/her standing in the field, and compare the candidate with other faculty of roughly the same cohort.*

*Please note that we do not ask you to make a recommendation regarding promotion itself, since that decision will be based partly on considerations such as teaching and service. Nor are we asking for a summary of the c.v.. What we seek is a substantive evaluation of the scholarly component of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ 's qualifications for promotion to the rank of \_\_\_\_\_. However, if you are in a position to comment on his/her teaching or other pertinent aspects of his/her professional activities, please feel free to do so.*

*Letters from Collaborators/Co-Authors:* As indicated above, letters from co-authors that document the contributions of the candidate to co-authored work should NOT be included among the letters of evaluation. They should instead be solicited by the Executive Officer and included in Part V.C. of the Forms.

Where you cannot adhere to the above guidelines for securing letters of recommendation, please provide a the reason and an explanation of the process used in the papers. Cases in which there is evidence of a failure to secure an objective evaluation may prejudice the case and may lead to a call for future review.

*Redacted Letters of Reference:* UIC does not have a policy of permitting candidates to read external letters from referees. **Therefore, in the interest of uniformity and fairness, candidates will NOT be allowed to read letters of reference in any form.**

*Translation of Letters of Reference:* In the event that a translation of letters of reference is needed, the department should identify two persons to handle the translation; one to provide the translation and one to ensure the accuracy.

*E-mail:* External letters of evaluation must be signed by the writer. Letters sent by e-mail are not acceptable. **Original copies with a signature will need to be submitted with the candidate's papers.**

*Confidentiality:* **The identity of the referees must not be disclosed to the candidate,** nor should comments made in P&T deliberations be attributed to the faculty members who made them.

Based on the Supreme Court decision in the University of Pennsylvania case, as well as recent court decisions involving discrimination claims by faculty who have been denied promotion and/or tenure, letters soliciting external reviews should state that the University shall maintain confidentiality of the identity of reviewer, **subject only to involuntary-disclosure in legal proceedings.**

**Candidate's Contribution (if any) to Collaborative Research:** (See Section V.C. of Part IV Forms). Unit **executive officers** are strongly encouraged to solicit letters from collaborators especially in multi-investigator studies. Letters from co-authors that document the contributions of the candidate to co-authored work should NOT be included among the letters of evaluation. They should instead be solicited by the Executive Officer and included in Part V.C. of the Forms.

**Candidate Access:** Prior to a formal vote at the department level, the unit officer of the initiating unit must provide all candidates an opportunity to review all non-evaluative sections of their case. Excluded are external letters of evaluation and any internal evaluative statements, including the executive officer's statement and letters from collaborators. Any candidate who disagrees with how the non-evaluative sections of the papers are presented may add a clarification statement to

be included in the promotion papers. **The candidate must attest with a signature that the non-evaluative sections are accurate.**

**Communication of Recommendations: Candidates for promotion and tenure must be informed in writing of the outcome of the vote on their case at each level of the review.** The vote of the department, and the recommendation of the Executive Officer, should be communicated by the Executive Officer to the candidate promptly and in writing. The candidate, at his or her request, is entitled to a brief, orally-rendered explanation from his or her executive officer of the rationale for endorsement or non-endorsement. Candidates should be given a copy of these policies and procedures, early in the review process.

## Section 5

### COLLEGE LEVEL REVIEWS

A copy of the most current college bylaws, or other documents covering P&T, should be on file in the Office of Academic Affairs, and any revisions affecting voting privileges in the college or departments should be forwarded to Academic Affairs no later than Monday, November 3, 2008. **If there have been no changes** since the previous year, please send an email to [michelem@uic.edu](mailto:michelem@uic.edu) stating the date of the bylaws currently in use in your unit.

#### A. COLLEGES NOT ORGANIZED BY DEPARTMENTS

In colleges not organized by departments, the vote will be that of the college executive committee and/or promotion and tenure committee, where these are two distinct bodies, and the recommendation of the dean.

#### B. THE LINE COLLEGE REVIEW

Review at the college level will include a vote of the college promotion and tenure committee and/or the executive committee, as defined in college bylaws; and the endorsement or non-endorsement of the college dean. The written recommendation of the dean, as well as the vote of the college advisory committee(s), become a part of the candidate's promotion and tenure papers.

**Communication of Recommendations: Candidates for promotion and tenure must be informed in writing of the outcome of the vote on their case at each level of the review.** The vote of the college, and the recommendation of the Dean, should be communicated by the Dean (with copy to the Executive Officer(s)) to the candidate promptly and in writing.

## Section 6

### REVIEWS BEYOND THE LINE COLLEGE

After the department and line college reviews, all cases will be submitted simultaneously to the Campus P&T Committee, the Graduate College, and the Office of Academic Affairs. The campus-level faculty review will be provided by the Campus P&T Committee that is advisory to the Graduate College

Dean and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The vote of the Campus P&T Committee will be recorded and made part of the official file along with any explanatory comments the Committee may want to provide as advice to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Dean of the Graduate College will also provide a recommendation.

*Academic Affairs and Chancellor Reviews:* All cases will be reviewed by Provost and Graduate College Dean in light of the entire record of assessment at other levels. The recommendations of the Provost and Graduate College Dean are then submitted to the Chancellor for final review and decision at the campus level.

*Communication of Recommendations:* **Candidates for promotion and tenure must be informed in writing of the outcome of the vote on their case at each level of the review.** The recommendations of the Provost and the Graduate College Dean should be communicated by the Dean (with copy to the Executive Officer(s)) to the candidate promptly and in writing.

## Section 7

### RECONSIDERATION AND APPEALS OF NEGATIVE DECISIONS

*Reconsideration:* Reconsideration is applicable in cases in which the candidate is alleging a procedural irregularity. Such procedural appeals may be raised at any stage of the process by writing to the line officer responsible for the level of review at which the alleged irregularity occurred. The only remedy for procedural irregularities that may be demonstrated by the candidate is the removal of the irregularity; that is, procedural irregularity alone does not necessarily alter a prior recommendation on the merits, and the appropriate next step is a re-review commencing at the level which led to the filing of a complaint. Every effort should be made to adjudicate any procedural appeals and carry out re-reviews, if warranted, within the overall timetable of the promotion and tenure process so as to provide the papers and the recommendations to the next review level on schedule. All subsequent review levels should be immediately notified by the executive officer if a delay is anticipated.

*Appeal:* **Appeals of the Vice Chancellor's action may only be made to the Chancellor at the end of the campus review process which ends with the Vice Chancellor's recommendation to the Chancellor.** Appeals, including supporting documentation, must be made in writing by the candidate and received in the Chancellor's office (2833UH) by 5PM on Monday, April 20, 2009.

*Petition for Seventh-Year Review:* Although rare, it is possible in the terminal year for the candidate to be re-evaluated for promotion and tenure, if a substantial development has occurred in his or her case that resolves issues raised in the sixth year review. To obtain a seventh-year review, the executive officer should petition the Dean who, upon concurrence, will submit the request to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Approval at the campus level is required to proceed further. Such approval is not automatic. If granted, the candidate's case is considered *de novo*.

In such cases, the candidate and executive officers are strongly encouraged to submit an application that addresses concerns raised in the sixth year review. If candidates who are re-evaluated in the terminal (formally called T-7) year are not supported for promotion, their appointment will last until the end of the current contract year. In other words, they will not receive an additional year beyond the 7<sup>th</sup> year.

## Section 8

## EXCLUSIONS

*Lecturers:* Promotions from the rank of lecturer to that of assistant professor do not require campus-level review.

### Section 9

#### NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE DELIBERATIONS

The foregoing policies and procedures try to ensure that candidates for P&T are periodically provided with information about their case, while simultaneously guaranteeing candid discussions at all levels of review. Unfortunately, there have been instances of attempts to sway a decision on behalf of a particular candidate, through telephone calls to or the solicitation of appointments with various administrators or individual faculty members of review committees, urging a particular position in a given case and seeking specific information at an untimely point in the process. **It is patently unprofessional for a candidate, advocate, or opponent of the candidate to engage in this kind of activity, and it is equally unprofessional for any person on a review body or an administrator to divulge confidential information. Nor should persons involved anticipate the release of information before the case has been properly acted upon in the promotion and tenure process. Aside from potential questions of legal liability, the greatest danger of such attempted persuasion is that it could affect a case negatively.**

Rev 06/08