

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO  
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES  
2003-2004

PART I  
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The Office of Academic Affairs sponsors a workshop each Fall 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, Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Room 2731 UH, M/C 103. Her e-mail address is 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/oaanew/policies\\_proced.html](http://www.uic.edu/depts/oa/oaanew/policies_proced.html)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Section 1</b>	ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF CASES .....	1
<b>Section 2</b>	INTERNAL REVIEWS .....	2
	A. MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEWS .....	2
	B. REVIEW OF FACULTY ON NON-TENURE TRACKS .....	3
	C. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS (NON-SALARIED/ADJUNCT APPOINTMENTS) ..	3
	D. JOINT APPOINTMENTS .....	3
	E. NON-RETENTION PRIOR TO THE SIXTH YEAR .....	3
	F. PROMOTION IN THE APPROPRIATE TRACK .....	3
	G. TRACK SWITCHING .....	4
	H. ROLLBACKS .....	4
<b>Section 3</b>	THE DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW .....	5
	A. USE OF THE FORMS IN PART IV .....	5
	B. VOTING RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES .....	5
	C. DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN P&T REVIEWS .....	7
<b>Section 4</b>	COLLEGE-LEVEL REVIEWS .....	11
	A. COLLEGES NOT ORGANIZED BY DEPARTMENTS .....	11
	B. LINE COLLEGE REVIEW .....	11
	C. REVIEW BEYOND THE LINE COLLEGE .....	11
	D. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CANDIDATE .....	11
	E. NEW INFORMATION .....	12
<b>Section 5</b>	RECONSIDERATION AND APPEALS OF NEGATIVE DECISIONS .....	14
<b>Section 6</b>	EXCLUSIONS .....	15
<b>Section 7</b>	NON-INFERENCE IN THE DELIBERATIONS .....	16

## Section 1

### ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF CASES

Each Dean must send to the Office of Academic Affairs a list of all third year review and promotion and tenure (P&T) cases to be considered in the year, including any that may lead to non-retention, no later than Monday, October 20, 2003.

Included in PART IV FORMS are three forms entitled, "Mid-Probationary - Expected Promotion and Tenure Reviews 2003-04", "Research and Clinical Non-Tenure Track - Expected Promotion and Tenure Reviews 2003-04", and "Academic (Research and Clinical) Tenure Track - Expected Promotion and Tenure Reviews 2003-2004". When completed, these lists should include both personnel actions in the tenure and non-tenure tracks, as well as mid-probation reviews. The candidate's name, department(s) (where applicable), the proposed personnel action (promotion, promotion and tenure, tenure in rank, non-retention), 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 2003-04.

\*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.

## Section 2

### INTERNAL REVIEWS

#### A. MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEWS

Campus policy requires 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. **The policy of including the third year review in the P&T packet will be implemented starting in academic year 2004-05.** If this is to be included for 03-04, please include it in the Evaluations section of the forms (See Part III & IV). Detailed instructions for processing mid-probation reviews are in a separate memo and can be found online at: [http://www.uic.edu/depts/aaa/aaanew/policies\\_procedures.html](http://www.uic.edu/depts/aaa/aaanew/policies_procedures.html).

#### B. 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.

#### 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 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 as page IVa.

#### D. JOINT APPOINTMENTS

For appointments split between two units, the appropriate faculty committee 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.

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

An unfavorable review 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. 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]).

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 a filing of Change-of-Status forms is 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; otherwise a terminal contract may be issued for the following year. Formal notice of non-renewal is issued by the Board of Trustees after the executive officer informs Academic 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).

#### F. 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 3 years.** 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.

#### G. 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. The final decision for changing tracks can now be made upon completion of year four of the probationary period.

#### H. 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. No more than two such rollbacks will be granted. A rollback may be granted in the case of disability or extended and/or severe personal illness.

A rollback may also be granted for compelling obligations to a member of the family or household that requires significant time away from University duties. Except in extraordinary circumstances, a rollback will be granted in the event of the birth or adoption of a child under six years old. Finally, a rollback may be granted under circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member, such as grave administrative error.

The candidate's record before the event must be consistent with the preservation of institutional quality. The criterion of this aspect 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.

## Section 3

### THE DEPARTMENTAL 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 of notification of non-retention, faculty in tenure code 6 may respond with a written resignation and be issued a terminal contract for the following year. If the candidate chooses to resign, the forms need not be submitted.

In proposing and reviewing the promotion of academic staff 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.).

Because the promotion and tenure processes are consultative, and largely collegial, questions occasionally arise about who should be involved in the process. The following definitions and procedures concerning voting, paper preparation, review and appeal serve to clarify the process.

If special circumstances in a particular academic unit give good reason to modify the procedures above, that unit may petition the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to approve exceptional procedures.

#### B. 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, chairs, and deans, are eligible to participate in discussion; however, because they provide independent judgement, 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. Chairs shall normally present the rationale for the departmental recommendation.

If there is disagreement between the department P&T committee and the executive officer, the majority view shall normally be presented by a faculty member who endorses that view, and the executive officer shall present independently his or her judgement.

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.

### C. 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 10, 2003 deadline).

*Who Should Be Reviewed:* All tenure-code 6 faculty must undergo university review for promotion and tenure unless they are resigning. Executive officers should also, on a regular basis, invite other 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 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.

*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.**

*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 paper and acknowledge this review with a signature on the cover sheet. The executive officer has final responsibility and authority for the content and presentation of the papers.**

*The External Evaluation:* In evaluating a candidate's scholarship, the department should obtain a written evaluation from **not less 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.

*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 arms 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.

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

*Information that Should be Sent to Referees:* All external referees should be sent copies of the candidate's **updated vita** and a sample of recent publications (i.e., publications since the last personnel action) and recent pre-prints.

*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 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. (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 be solicited by the Executive Officer and included in PART IV FORMS, V.E.)

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 candidate's 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.

Cases in which there is evidence of a failure to secure an objective evaluation may prejudice the review and may lead to an additional evaluation.

*Redacted Letters of Reference:* In the past, a few departments permitted candidates to read external letters from referees after identification of referees was suitably removed. **In the interest of uniformity and fairness, candidates will NOT be allowed to read letters of reference.**

*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 Access:* Prior to a formal vote at the department level, the unit officer of the initiating unit must provide all candidates access to the formal presentation of their case, with the exception of external letters of evaluation and any internal evaluative statements, including the executive officer's statement. 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 will have to 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 vote outcome of their case at each level of review and the endorsement or non-endorsement by their unit's executive officer.**

The vote of the department, and the recommendation of the executive officer, should be communicated 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 4

### 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 10, 2003. **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.

#### C. 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 the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in light of the entire record of assessment at other levels. The recommendations of the Vice Chancellor are then submitted to the Chancellor for final review and decision at the campus level.

#### D. 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. Such communication must be made by the executive officer who, along with any intermediate administrative officers, will be informed of the outcome in a prompt and timely fashion by the recommending officer or review body at each stage of the review.

*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, line college, Graduate 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:* A candidate is entitled to stop the review process at any time by giving a letter to their department executive officer.

A candidate at T-6, 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 effective no later than August 31 of the following academic year, before the papers are forwarded to the next level for review. He or she will then be issued a terminal contract for the specified year of resignation. For example, if a departmental vote in November, 2003 in a sixth year review is negative, the candidate may elect to resign effective no later than August 31, 2005.

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 either case, 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.

#### E. 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 judgement 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, 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 5

### 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.** 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 19, 2004.

*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 reconsidered *de novo*.

## Section 6

### EXCLUSIONS

*Lecturers:* Promotions from the rank of lecturer to that of assistant professor do not require campus-level review in cases in which such promotion has been contingent on internal factors of which the candidate has been advised, i.e., the completion of a degree program or residency. Such a promotion, however, cannot be used to circumvent the affirmative action requirements that would be attached to the advertisement of a new assistant professorship.

## Section 7

### 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 08/03