

August 6, 2003

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Deans

FROM: Mrinalini C. Rao  
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

SUBJECT: **PROMOTION AND TENURE 2003-2004**

As presented to you at the June Dean's Council meeting, we are undertaking a two step effort to improve the presentation of information needed for the promotion and tenure process. As these are the most critical steps in a faculty's academic career, we wish to ensure that the candidate's information is presented in the best possible light. We **request that you strongly encourage the unit heads, paper preparers and candidates** to review carefully the policies and procedures for promotion and tenure, especially Part I of Attachment 3. We appreciate the efforts that you, the faculty, unit heads and responsible administrators put into the process while ensuring that quality, consideration of different norms and confidentiality is maintained.

The attached information provides the deadlines, policies, procedures, and forms for promotion and tenure recommendations for the 2003-2004 academic year. These documents can be downloaded from the Provost's website at:

[http://www.uic.edu/depts/oa/oaanew/policies\\_proced.html](http://www.uic.edu/depts/oa/oaanew/policies_proced.html).

Attachment 1 provides the deadlines for this year's reviews.

Attachment 2 highlights the significant changes made in the P&T document for 2003-04.

Also attached is a complete set of 2003-2004 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Forms. The set contains 5 parts:

PART I	POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
PART II	SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PREPARATION OF AN EFFECTIVE PROMOTION AND TENURE CASE
PART III	INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PREPARER AND TYPIST
PART IV	FORMS
PART V	CHECKLISTS FOR PREPARERS AND TYPISTS

Attachments (3)

cc: R. M. Tanner  
William Jones

Attachment 1

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO  
PROMOTION AND TENURE DEADLINES  
2003-2004**

DATE	ACTION
Monday, October 20, 2003	Deans notify the Office of Academic Affairs of promotion and tenure (P&T) cases under review in their units, as well as mid-probation reviews - academic (research and clinical). Use the "Mid-Probation Reviews 2003-04" and "Expected Promotion and Tenure Reviews 2003-2004" forms included in the forms packet, PART IV.
Monday, November 10, 2003	Deans notify the Office of Academic Affairs of any changes in department and/or college P&T procedures since last year.
<b>NEW</b> Thursday, January 8, 2004	Deans submit personnel action forms for <b>ALL</b> P&T recommendations including tenure-track, tenured or non-tenure-track candidates ( <b>academic, research, and clinical tracks</b> ). The original plus 9 copies plus a copy on disc* of each dossier should be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs, 2731 UH. *All the dossiers from a College must be submitted on a single disc. <b>See Part III for specific instructions.</b>
Wednesday, January 14, 2004	Change of Status forms for the non-retention of faculty members with tenure symbol "1" due to Academic Human Resources, M/C 900.
Wednesday, February 25, 2004	Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee submits its recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The recommendations are also forwarded to the Graduate College Dean.
Thursday, April 1, 2004	The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs submits recommendations to the Chancellor and notifies Deans and Executive Officers of the recommendations. Appeals, including supporting documentation, of the VCAA's decision to the Chancellor must be made by 5:00 PM on Monday, April 19.
Monday, May 3, 2004	The Chancellor notifies faculty of her decision regarding promotion and/or tenure.
Wednesday, May 5, 2004	Deans submit (summaries of) mid-probation reviews to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (2731 UH).
Wednesday, July 7, 2004	Change of Status forms for the non-retention of faculty members with tenure symbol "2" through "6" who will be issued a terminal contract for AY 03-04 due at Academic Human Resources, M/C 900.

## Attachment 2

### UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES HIGHLIGHTS AND/OR CHANGES 2003-2004

**Notification:** Notification of all cases should be sent to the Office of Academic Affairs, 2731 UH by October 20, 2003. The only exclusions from the promotion and tenure process are faculty with the titles of Lecturer or Instructor. **ALL** others – academic (research and clinical) tenure track, research and clinical non-tenure track – must be submitted for review. There are separate forms for the academic tenure track (research or clinical) and for non-tenure track (research or clinical). **Please note that the name and phone number of the paper preparer for each candidate must be included with the notification should the campus require further information.**

**Date of Submission:** The date for submission of papers to the Office of Academic Affairs is January 8, 2004.

**Numbers of Copies:** An original and 9 paper copies will be needed, as well as the information on a disc(s). Each College should submit the dossiers for all of the candidates from the unit on a single disc (zip acceptable) if possible. See Part III, for specific instructions.

**Modified Format of Forms:** There are no changes in the content for the papers, but three changes in the order in which the file will be presented:

- 1) The document will have a Table of Contents (Please refer to Part III, Preparing the Forms).
- 2) All information should be presented in **chronological** order.
- 3) All evaluation statements will be put at the end of the package. These include:
  - Confidential Teaching Evaluations
  - Departmental review committee statement, if any
  - Head's statement (A combined statement addressing Teaching [including contributions to curriculum development], Research, including contributions to collaborative research, if any, and Service under separate headings).
  - Dean's statement

(Please refer to Part III, Preparing the Forms)

**Courtesy Appointments (Non-Salaried and/or Adjunct):** Although no formal review is required, a letter should be included from the department executive officer giving support to the promotion for 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 and can be inserted after the head's letter in the evaluations section. (See Part I., 2.C).

**Joint Appointments:** For appointments split between two units, the appropriate faculty committees in both units should vote independently to recommend promotion and/or tenure in their respective units, and the department executive officers of both 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 department executive officers. (See Part I., 2.D).

**Track Switching:** Previously, a track switch from tenure track to non-tenure track was to occur no later than the end of the third year or beginning of the fourth year of probation. Effective as of February 7, 2000, the final decision for changing tracks can now be made upon completion of year four of the probationary period.

**Letters of Reference and E-Mail:** PART I., 3.C. makes it clear that copies of e-mail letters of reference may **not** be used. A letter of reference must be signed by the letter writer and submitted with the papers. Solicitation letters to referees should **NOT** include language which suggests that the

candidate can see the letters with the name and institution removed. Originals must be included in the original packet submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs. Candidates will **NOT** be allowed to read 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.

**Mid-Probation Reviews:** Though the executive officer of a department has the authority to decide whether or not to renew the contract of a person who is probationary, it is now necessary to make sure that the executive officer has consulted with the departmental advisory or executive committee. In any cases in which you contemplate non-retention, please contact University Counsel.

- All mid-probation evaluations should be reviewed and signed by the Dean of the respective college. The faculty member has to endorse that he/she has received and read a copy of the evaluation.
- **The policy of including the third year review in the P&T packet will be implemented starting in academic year 2004-05.**
- Detailed instructions for processing mid-probation reviews are in a separate memo and can be found online at: [http://www.uic.edu/depts/oa/oaanew/policies\\_procedures.html](http://www.uic.edu/depts/oa/oaanew/policies_procedures.html).

**Teaching Evaluation:** It is inappropriate to ask current doctoral students supervised by the candidate to write a teaching evaluation for the candidate.

**Research Ability and Achievement:** (See Section II. G. of Part IV Forms – Candidate's Contributions (if any) to Collaborative Research). This has been clarified to make clear that this section is to be filled out by the executive officer, rather than be prepared by the candidate.

- **Record of Patents** - Patent information may be listed under category "h" in Research Ability and Achievement, Section II. F. 1-4 of Part IV Forms.
- **On-Line Refereed Journals** may be included with Articles in refereed journals, Section II. F 1-4 of Part IV Forms.
- **Publications and Grant Proposals** - the outcome of publications or grant proposals identified as (submitted) or (pending) should be communicated to the relevant committees as soon as this is known. All new communications after the dossier has left the College should be numbered in continuation and should have the candidate's name in the upper right-hand corner.

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

- Referees should be from strong departments at major research institutions, such as those typically found among Research I, AAU, or premier foreign institutions. If referees are from industry, government, or universities of lesser reputation, please establish the appropriateness of the selection.
- All referees from universities must be **full professors or equivalent** with outstanding scholarly accomplishments in the candidate's field.
- Candidates are **not** allowed to submit a list of potential referees to the department
- The candidate 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.
- To make the strongest possible case, except in unusual circumstances, dissertation advisors or collaborators should not be chosen as referees.

- It is preferable that all reviewers be at “arm’s length” from the candidate. However, in some fields, (especially smaller and newer disciplines), it may be necessary to modify this requirement (e.g. if the most appropriate reviewers are known to the candidate or are not full professors). In **all** cases, such modifications, including any relationship between the reviewer and the candidate, must be clearly spelled out. It should not be assumed that, even though specifically asked, that this information will be contained in the reviewer’s letter.
- In order to give a yield of **at least 4** substantial responses, the executive officer should obtain a written evaluation from not less than 5, but no more than 8 appropriate reviewers. All correspondence with reviewers should be included in the P&T packet even if the reviewer’s letter is a simple statement of inability/unwillingness to review.

Where you cannot observe these recommendations, please provide an explanation in the papers.

**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. A sample letter is found in Part III of the P&T Policies and Procedures. 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.

To offer a comprehensive report, the referees should be asked to:

- Compare the candidate with other faculty of roughly the same cohort. Specific names and affiliations would sharpen the comparisons.
- Comment on both the quantity and quality of the candidates' scholarship relative to the standards in the field.
- Estimate the impact of the candidate's scholarship on the appropriate field and, especially for full professor candidates, indicate his/her standing in the field.
- Remark on the quality of the publishing outlets and the source of funding when such is not obvious.
- Discuss the work in a critical fashion and **do not summarize the CV.**
- Specify all relationships with the candidate.

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.

All external referees should be sent copies of the candidate's vita and a sample of recent publications (i.e., publications since the last personnel action and recent pre-prints). Referees should be invited to request further samples.

**Sample Letters of Solicitation:** Along with a copy of the letter used to solicit the reviews of outside evaluators, a detailed list of all the materials sent to the reviewers and how many reviewers were solicited. In the case of unpublished material, it should be clearly specified in what form and how much material was sent out - outline, draft, proofs, etc.

**Service - Grant Review Activity:** Grant review activity may be recorded under Section III. F., Service to the Profession/Discipline, in Part IV Forms.

**Use of Checklists:** In order to ensure that the papers have been prepared in accordance with the campus guidelines, it will be required that the preparer and typist fill out these checklists, and that they are endorsed by the Office of the Dean of the College. When the papers are delivered to the Office of Academic Affairs, these checklists should be appended to the original copy only. Papers **WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED** without appropriate checklists.

Rev. 8/03