

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO
CLINICAL NON-TENURE TRACK
PROMOTION GUIDELINES
2011-2012**

**PART I
GENERAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

All requests for further information and explanation regarding these documents should be directed to Mary Abundo, Room 2731 UH, M/C 103. Her email address is uicpt@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/oaa/pt.html>.

SECTION 1	PRIOR TO PROMOTION REVIEW OF FACULTY IN THE CLINICAL NON-TENURE TRACK	4
	A. TRACK SWITCHING	4
	B. REVIEW OF CLINICAL NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY	4
SECTION 2	THE PROMOTION REVIEW	4
	A. GENERAL	4
	B. JOINT APPOINTMENTS	4
	C. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS (NON-SALARIED/ADJUNCT APPOINTMENTS)	5
	D. PROMOTION IN THE APPROPRIATE TRACK	5
	E. VOTING RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES	5
	F. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CANDIDATE	7
	G. NEW INFORMATION	7
SECTION 3	DEPARTMENTAL REVIEWS	8
	A. WHO SHOULD BE REVIEWED	8
	B. JOINT APPOINTMENTS	8
	C. TIMETABLE	8
	D. RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE CASE	.8
	E. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES AND ACCESS	.8
	F. EXTERNAL EVALUATION	.9
	G. CANDIDATE'S CONTRIBUTION TO COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH	11
	H. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS	11
SECTION 4	COLLEGE-LEVEL REVIEWS	12
	A. COLLEGES NOT ORGANIZED BY DEPARTMENTS	12
	B. LINE COLLEGE REVIEW	12
	C. JOINT APPOINTMENTS	12
	D. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS	12
SECTION 5	REVIEWS AND COMMUNICATIONS BEYOND THE LINE COLLEGE	13
	A. CAMPUS PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE	13

	B.	VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND PROVOST (VCAA AND DEAN OF GRADUATE COLLEGE)	13
	C.	CHANCELLOR REVIEW	14
SECTION 6		RECONSIDERATION AND APPEALS OF NEGATIVE DECISIONS	14
	A.	RECONSIDERATION	14
	B.	APPEAL	15
SECTION 7		EXCLUSIONS	15
SECTION 8		NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE DELIBERATION	15

SECTION 1

PRIOR TO PROMOTION REVIEW OF FACULTY IN THE CLINICAL NON-TENURE TRACK

A. TRACK SWITCHING

FROM TENURE-TRACK TO CLINICAL NON-TENURE TRACK. 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 unit executive office may decide that a change from a tenure track to a clinical non-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. Requests for track switching from tenure-track to clinical non-tenure track should originate with the faculty member, endorsed by the unit executive officer and dean and approved by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost. The Campus does not normally permit candidates to be promoted at this track unless they have been in the track for at least 2 years.

FROM CLINICAL NON-TENURE TRACK TO TENURE-TRACK. Requests for track switching from clinical non-tenure track to tenure-track should also originate with the faculty member, endorsed by the unit executive officer and dean and approved by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Should a switch be desirable, the faculty member should start on this track at most at the beginning of the 4th year of its probationary period. The campus does not normally permit candidate to be promoted at this track unless they have been in this track for at least 2 years.

B. REVIEW OF CLINICAL NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

It is in the interests of both the clinical non-tenure track faculty member and the department where the clinical non-tenure track faculty member is eligible for consideration for promotion that the faculty member be reviewed at the department level at least three years prior to the time of the anticipated university review for promotion.

Section 2

THE PROMOTION REVIEW

A. GENERAL

In proposing and reviewing the promotion of faculty members, in accordance to the Statutes (Article IX, Section 3e), "special consideration" shall be given to the following:

- 1) teaching ability and performance
- 2) research/scholarship ability, creative activity, and achievement
- 3) ability and performance in continuing education, public service, committee work, professional practices, and special assignments designed to promote the quality and effectiveness of academic programs and services

Each college/academic unit has specific P&T norms and criteria specific to its disciplines. These guidelines should be followed accordingly.

B. JOINT APPOINTMENTS

For (non-zero percent) appointments split between two or more units, the external referees should be chosen by mutual discussion and agreement among all relevant unit executive officers. The appropriate faculty committees of the units should independently recommend promotion in their respective units, and the unit executive officers should each complete the Evaluation from the Unit Executive Officer in the Promotion Forms (Part IV.F.). For candidates having a joint appointment in two (or more) different

colleges, the appropriate faculty committees of the colleges should independently recommend promotion in their respective colleges and each dean must complete the Evaluation from the College Dean in the Promotion Forms (Part IV.G.).

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

Although no formal review is required, a letter should be included from the unit 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 unit executive officer's letter of justification in the standard Promotion papers. It should be inserted after the Evaluation from the Unit Executive Officer in the Promotion Form (Part IV.F.).

D. PROMOTION IN THE APPROPRIATE TRACK

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. VOTING RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES

The University of Illinois Statutes, (Article II, Section 3, Para.a.1.) includes as faculty "those members of the academic staff with the rank or title in that unit 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 members 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 state that "The bylaws of any academic unit may further mandate a minimum percent faculty appointment in that unit for specific 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 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, Para 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 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.

Lowest Level: Eligible voters on particular promotion 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 and tenure 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.

Additionally, voting faculty who hold non-zero percentage appointments in more than one department may only vote once for any given candidate and that vote should be in the voting faculty member's home department.

Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees: Departmental bylaws or other documents 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, those with fewer than three eligible voters, the dean, with appropriate advice, **must** establish a promotion and tenure committee including faculty from other UIC units who are qualified by expertise and who meet all other eligibility standards according to the rules outlined above.

If there is a split vote,(equal number of positive and negative votes), the rationale for the vote must be addressed in the letter of the unit executive officer or the unit P&T committee.

Disagreement between Promotion and Tenure Committee and Unit Executive Officer/Dean: If there is a disagreement between the departmental P&T committee and the unit executive officer, the departmental P&T committee must submit a separate letter addressing the basis of its vote. If there is a disagreement between the college P&T committee and the dean, the college P&T committee must submit a separate letter addressing the rationale for the vote. In either case, this may not become apparent until after the unit executive officer or unit dean renders judgment of the candidate. These letters should be inserted following the evaluations of the unit executive officer or unit dean, as appropriate.

*College Promotion and Tenure Committees:*College bylaws or other documents covering P&T policies and procedures may establish a college promotion and tenure committee consisting of some subset of tenured faculty, in addition to an executive committee, to review and vote on promotion and tenure cases. In any instance of a split vote, (equal number of positive and negative votes), the rationale for the vote must be addressed by the dean or the College P&T Committee.

College Peer Evaluation Process for Clinical Non-Tenure Faculty: The college is encouraged (but not required) to develop a peer evaluation process for promotion of clinical non-tenure faculty. The process for peer evaluation may be at the department or college level. The description of the process of this optional evaluation should be included. A suggestion for such a process could be to develop a clinical non-tenure faculty promotion committee. If your unit does not have a separate process you will be asked to indicate that in the forms.

Unit Executive Officers and Deans: Unit executive officers and dean are eligible to participate in discussion in the P&T committees; however, because they provide independent recommendations, they do not vote within their units. The role of unit executive officers and deans is to take the votes of the relevant committees under advisement when presenting their independent recommendations, with accompanying rationales.

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 or her 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 *inabsentia* is not usually permitted at the college level. Voting *in absentia*, while not encouraged, is permitted at the departmental level, provided that 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 where the first level of voting is at the college level, the conditions above apply to the college.

F. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CANDIDATE

The votes of any review committees (number of yes, no, abstain, absent, not eligible votes) and the recommendations for the unit executive officer, dean, dean of the Graduate College, and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost 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 and Recommendation of Unit Executive Officer(s) - communicated to candidate by the unit executive officer(s)

College Vote and Recommendation of the Dean - communicated to candidate by the Dean with copy to unit executive officer(s).

Campus P&T Committee vote - communicated to the candidate by the Dean with copy to unit executive officer(s).

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost and Graduate College Dean's recommendations - communicated to the candidate by the Dean with copy to unit executive officer(s).

Following the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost, and the Graduate College Dean, the Chancellor's recommendation is sent directly to the candidate with copies to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost, the Graduate College Dean, the Dean, and the unit executive officer(s).

In all situations where a recommendation is made, the candidate has one week (seven calendar days) from the date of issue on the notification to withdraw his or her case. If no communication is received from the candidate, the next appropriate step will be taken.

Debriefing Opportunities: The candidate is entitled to a brief, orally-rendered explanation from his or her unit executive officer of the rationale for the recommendation at each level of review. Because all levels of review prior to the Board of Trustees' decision 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 and Provost. 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.

A faculty member may choose to withdraw from the review at any point of the review process.

G. NEW INFORMATION

Because of the length of the review process, it is possible that the candidate's record may change 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 unit executive officer or the paper preparer, new information could affect the outcome of the case, it should be submitted at any stage of the process by the unit executive officer.** In the interest of time and consistency, the unit 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 include a note on (or with) the new material indicating at what level of review the new information became available.

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

Section 3

DEPARTMENTAL 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 7, 2011 deadline).

A. WHO SHOULD BE REVIEWED

Unit executive officers should meet with all clinical assistant and clinical associate professors on a regular basis to discuss their academic credentials for the purpose of determining when a review for promotion would be appropriate. Faculty should be notified of the availability of these and other policies and procedures early in the review process.

B. JOINT APPOINTMENTS

For (non-zero percent) appointments split between two or more units, the external referees should be chosen by mutual discussion and agreement among all relevant unit executive officers. The appropriate faculty committees of the units should independently recommend promotion in their respective units, and the unit executive officers should each complete the Evaluation from the Unit Executive Officer in the P&T Forms (Part IV.F.). For candidates having a joint appointment in two (or more) different colleges, the appropriate faculty committees of the colleges should independently recommend promotion in their respective colleges and each dean must complete the Evaluation from the College Dean in the P&T Forms (Part IV.G.).

C. 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 during the Spring term prior to the year in which the university review would take place. This includes, for example, preliminary review of possible candidates' dossiers and the compilation of lists of appropriate referees.

D. RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE CASE

The unit executive officer takes responsibility for the preparation of the papers, unless the dean assigns someone else the responsibility, as, for example, when the unit executive officer is the candidate. (Instructions for units not organized as departments are given in the next section). **In order to be the paper preparer, the unit executive officer must be eligible to vote for the candidate. If the unit 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. In those situations (when the unit executive officer is an associate professor and the candidate is being recommended for promotion to full professor), the statement of endorsement or non-endorsement will be prepared by a full professor who is charged with preparing the case. By signing the cover sheet, the paper preparer assumes full responsibility for the accuracy of the contents of the dossier.**

E. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES AND ACCESS

The candidate is responsible for furnishing to the paper preparer the information which is required to complete the forms and forward the case, but does not determine the content and presentation of the

case. **The unit executive officer/paper preparer has final responsibility and authority for the content and presentation of the papers.**

Prior to a formal vote at the department level, the unit executive 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 unit 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.**

F. EXTERNAL EVALUATION

In evaluating a candidate's scholarship, the department should obtain a written evaluation from **no fewer than 3 but no more than 5** 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 unit executive officer, **not** by the candidate.

Selection of Referees for the External Evaluation

Because the choice of outside references is critical to evaluating the candidate, the following guidelines should be observed:

Quality of Referees

- Referees should be members of the relevant profession(s) or discipline(s) who have not had a close association with the candidate. Peer faculty in a rank at or above where the faculty member is being considered for promotion may be solicited. Reviewers may be non-tenured
- 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 only if a proper evaluation of the candidate's 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 3 referees satisfying the above criteria who have the expertise necessary 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 an adequate 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, 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 promotion papers.
- Basic knowledge of the candidate (e.g., having heard the candidate speak at conferences, or simply 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 whom they believe **are inappropriate** along with the reasons for their proposed exclusion. Though such a list is not binding, the unit 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 email, 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 5 potential referees may need to be contacted until a pool of at least 3 willing, objective referees is assembled. **A list of all such contacts, with the responses (or lack thereof) is to be included with the papers.** (See attached Sample A in Part III, Section 7B.).

The second contact is the official letter. (See attached Sample B in Part III, Section 7B).

Information that should be sent to referees in the second letter: All referees should be sent the candidate's updated *curriculum vitae*, unit norms and standards in relation to teaching, service, professional practices and/or associated scholarship (defined by the unit); the candidate's statement on accomplishments and future plans in areas reflected in the unit norms and standards (e.g. statement related to teaching, service, professional practices, and/or associated scholarship (as defined by the unit)); and documentation providing evidence for the candidate's excellence in accordance with the unit norms and guidelines.

Solicitation of letters: The solicitation of letters of evaluation should come from the unit executive officer or paper preparer, never from the candidate. It should be clear that the purpose of the letter is to obtain a candid assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in accordance with the unit norms and standards. Letters should indicate the rank for which the candidate is being considered and that the award of tenure is not 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 an appraisal of the candidate and not merely summarize the candidate's *curriculum vitae*.

It is important to give adequate time for the referees to write their letters. Ideally, requests should be sent out as early as possible (e.g., by the end of May). 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.

Letters from Collaborators/Co-Authors

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 unit executive officer and included in Part V.C. of the Forms. Where the above guidelines for securing letters of recommendation cannot be adhered to, please provide the reason along with an explanation of the process used in the papers. 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

In the interest of uniformity and fairness, candidates will NOT be allowed to read letters of reference in any form.

Letters Received After Departmental Review

In a situation where a letter that has been solicited in a timely fashion is received after the requested date and the dossier has moved on to the next level of review, the unit executive officer must forward the letter to the appropriate level of review following the procedures outlined in Part I, Section 2, G, New Information.

Translation of Letters of Reference

In the event that a translation of letters of reference is needed, the department should identify two people to handle the translation; one to provide the translation and one to ensure its accuracy.

E-Mailed Letters of Reference

Since external letters of evaluation must be signed by the author, reviewers should be encouraged to submit their evaluations in letter format with their ink signature. However, there are times when this is not possible. Therefore for those communications sent electronically, there are two ways that will be allowed:

1. a letter on letterhead with a signature; this letter can either be sent as an attachment in an email either in PDF format or, if the signatures are embedded electronically, in WORD format.
2. if the reviewer chooses to send an email containing the evaluation/comments, the email must contain an electronic signature along with their title and institutional information (name of institution, address, phone number, etc), and preferably from an institutional email account.

Confidentiality

The identity of the referees must not be disclosed to the candidate. Letters soliciting external reviews should state that the University shall maintain confidentiality of the identity of review, subject only to involuntary disclosure in legal proceedings.

G. CANDIDATE'S CONTRIBUTION TO COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH

Unit executive officer(s) should solicit letters from collaborators especially in multi-investigator studies. Letters from the collaborators should address the candidate's contributions to the joint work. 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 unit executive officer and included in Part IV, V.C. of the Forms.

H. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Candidates for promotion 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(s) (number of yes, no, abstain, absent, and not eligible votes) and the recommendation of the unit executive officer(s) must be communicated by the unit executive officer(s) to the candidate promptly and in writing. The candidates, at his or her request, are

entitled to a brief, orally-rendered explanation from his or her unit executive officer of the rationale for the recommendation.

Section 4

COLLEGE LEVEL REVIEWS

A copy of the most current college bylaws, norms and expectations, 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 7, 2011**. If there have been no changes since the previous year, please send an email to michelem@uic.edu stating the approval 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 recommendation of the college dean. Additionally, it is encouraged (but not required) that a peer evaluation process for clinical non-tenure faculty be developed at the college level. The description of the process of this optional evaluation should be placed in the dossier following the unit's norms and criteria. A suggestion for such a process could be to develop a clinical non-tenure faculty promotion committee. If such a process does take place, the outcome of the evaluation should be included in the evaluations section of the dossier, Part IV, V.E. . (See Part III for detailed instructions) The written recommendation of the dean(s), as well as the vote of the college advisory committee(s), becomes a part of the candidate's promotion papers.

C. JOINT APPOINTMENTS

For (non-zero percent) appointments split between two or more units, the external referees should be chosen by mutual discussion and agreement among all relevant unit executive officers. The appropriate faculty committees of the units should independently recommend promotion in their respective units, and the unit executive officers should each complete the Evaluation from the Unit Executive Officer in the P&T Forms (Part IV.F.). For candidates having a joint appointment in two (or more) different colleges, the appropriate faculty committees of the colleges should independently recommend promotion in their respective colleges and each dean must complete the Evaluation from the College Dean in the P&T Forms (Part IV.G.).

D. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Candidates for promotion 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(s), (number of yes, no, abstain, absent, and not eligible votes) and the recommendation(s) of the dean should be communicated by the dean(s) to the candidate (with copy to the unit executive officers(s)) promptly and in writing. The candidate, at his or her request, is entitled to a brief, orally-rendered explanation from his or her unit executive officer of the rationale for the recommendation.

Section 5

REVIEWS AND COMMUNICATION BEYOND THE LINE COLLEGE

A. CAMPUS PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

After the department and line college reviews, all cases will be submitted for review by the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee. The vote of the Campus P&T Committee will be recorded and made part of the official file along with explanatory comments the Committee may want to provide as advice to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate College.

Communication of Recommendations to the Candidates

The vote (number of yes, no, abstain, absent, and not eligible votes) must be communicated by the Dean(s) (with copy to the unit executive officer(s)) to the candidate promptly and in writing.

Sample Letter to be Used To Candidate from Dean for Notification of Campus Promotion and Tenure Vote:

Dear _____:

This letter is to notify you that the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee has review your file. The 27 member committee vote:

___yes ___no ___abstain ___absent ___ not eligible

Sincerely,

Dean

cc: Unit Executive Officer(s)

B. VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (VCAA) AND PROVOST AND DEAN OF GRADUATE COLLEGE

Following the review of the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee, all cases will then be reviewed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) and Provost and the Dean of the Graduate College in light of the entire record of assessment at other levels. The joint recommendation of the VCAA and Provost and the Dean of the Graduate College will be simultaneously communicated through the VCAA and Provost to the deans(s) of the college(s) and to the Chancellor, with copies to the Unit Executive Officer(s).

Communication of Recommendations to the Candidates

The recommendations of the VCAA and Provost and the Dean of the Graduate College must be communicated by the dean (with copy to the unit executive officer(s)) to the candidate promptly and in writing.

Sample Letter To Candidate from Dean for Notification of VCAA and Provost and Graduate College Dean's Negative Recommendation:

Dear _____:

This letter is to notify you that I have received notification from the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost,, who, with endorsement by the Dean of the Graduate College, cannot support your case for promotion to (insert appropriate faculty title).

The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost offers you the opportunity for oral debriefing and discussion of your case. The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (insert name), will be available to meet with you for this purpose. Please contact (insert name) at (insert phone number) to schedule an appointment.

If you wish to appeal this decision, your request must be made in writing directly the Chancellor by 5:00 pm on (insert date). The Chancellor will notify you of her recommendation by (insert date).

Sincerely,

Dean

cc: Unit Executive Officer(s)

C. CHANCELLOR REVIEW

The Chancellor will review the record in its entirety and make a final recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

Communication of Recommendations to the Candidates

The Chancellor notifies the candidate of the campus recommendation that will be made to the Board of Trustees for final action.

Section 6

RECONSIDERATION AND APPEALS OF NEGATIVE DECISIONS

A. RECONSIDERATION

Reconsideration is possible/available only 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 is successfully 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 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 unit officer if a delay is anticipated.

B. APPEAL

Appeals will only be considered after the VCAA and Provost's recommendation to the Chancellor has been made. Appeals, including supporting documentation, must be made in writing by the candidate and received in the Chancellor's office (2833 UH) by 5PM on ,April 16, 2012.

Section 7

EXCLUSIONS

Lecturers

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

Section 8

NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE DELIBERATIONS

The foregoing policies and procedures try to ensure that candidates for promotion 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.5/11