



**CLINICAL NON-TENURE TRACK  
PROMOTION GUIDELINES  
2016-17**

**PART I**

**UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES**

All requests for further information and explanation regarding Campus Promotion and Tenure (P&T) policies should be directed toward Renée Taylor, the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs: (312) 413-3470 | [rtaylor@uic.edu](mailto:rtaylor@uic.edu). Questions about procedures and instructions for the corresponding forms should be directed toward Campus P&T Coordinators, Andrew Maybach and Faizan H. Abid, in the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs: (312) 996-2706 | [amayba2@uic.edu](mailto:amayba2@uic.edu) | [fabid2@uic.edu](mailto:fabid2@uic.edu).



**Table of Contents**

**SECTION 1: PRIOR TO PROMOTION REVIEW IN THE CLINICAL NON-TENURE TRACK 4**

**A. REVIEW OF CLINICAL NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY ..... 4**

**B. TRACK SWITCHING ..... 4**

    1. Tenure-Track to Clinical Non-Tenure Track ..... 4

    2. Clinical Non-Tenure Track to Tenure-Track ..... 4

**SECTION 2: THE PROMOTION REVIEW ..... 5**

**A. GENERAL ..... 5**

    1. Norms and Criteria ..... 5

    2. Confidentiality ..... 5

**B. JOINT APPOINTMENTS ..... 5**

**C. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS (NON-SALARIED/ADJUNCT APPOINTMENTS) ..... 5**

**D. PROMOTION IN THE APPROPRIATE TRACK ..... 6**

**E. VOTING RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES ..... 6**

    1. Types of Faculty Eligible to Vote ..... 6

        a. Exceptions ..... 6

        b. Rank ..... 7

    2. Lowest Level ..... 7

        a. Voting for Jointly-Appointed Faculty ..... 7

    3. Voting and Dual Relationships (Family Members, Collaborators, and Former Mentors) ..... 7

        a. Family Members ..... 7

        b. Internal Collaborations ..... 8

    4. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees ..... 8

    5. College Promotion and Tenure Committees ..... 8

    6. Unit Executive Officers and Deans ..... 9

    7. Disagreement between Promotion and Tenure Committee and Unit Executive Officer/Dean ..... 9

    8. Voting in Absentia ..... 9

**F. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CANDIDATE ..... 9**

    Debriefing Opportunities ..... 10

**G. WITHDRAWAL FROM THE REVIEW PROCESS ..... 10**

**H. NEW INFORMATION ..... 10**

**SECTION 3: UNIT LEVEL REVIEWS ..... 11**

**A. WHO SHOULD BE REVIEWED ..... 11**



- B. JOINT APPOINTMENTS ..... 11**
- C. TIMETABLE ..... 11**
- D. RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE CASE ..... 11**
- E. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES AND ACCESS ..... 12**
- F. EXTERNAL EVALUATION ..... 12**
  - 1. Selection of Referees for the External Evaluation ..... 12
  - 2. Objectivity and Conflicts of Interest ..... 13
  - 3. The Solicitation of Referees ..... 13
    - a. Information that should be sent to referees in the first stage ..... 13
    - b. Information that should be sent to referees in the second stage ..... 14
  - 5. Letters from Collaborators/Co-Authors ..... 15
  - 6. Letters Received After Departmental Review ..... 15
  - 7. Translation of Letters of External Evaluation ..... 15
- G. CANDIDATE'S CONTRIBUTION TO COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH ..... 16**
- H. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 16**
- SECTION 4: COLLEGE LEVEL REVIEWS ..... 16**
  - A. COLLEGES NOT ORGANIZED BY DEPARTMENTS ..... 16**
  - B. THE LINE COLLEGE REVIEW ..... 16**
  - C. JOINT APPOINTMENTS ..... 16**
  - D. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 17**
- SECTION 5: REVIEWS AND COMMUNICATION BEYOND THE LINE COLLEGE ..... 17**
  - A. CAMPUS PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE ..... 17**
    - 1. Communication of Recommendations to the Candidates ..... 17
  - B. REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION BY THE PROVOST/ VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS/VICE CHANCELLOR FOR HEALTH AFFAIRS (APPLICABLE TO HEALTH SCIENCES COLLEGES) AND DEAN OF GRADUATE COLLEGE ..... 17**
    - Communication of Recommendations to the Candidates ..... 18
  - C. CHANCELLOR'S REVIEW ..... 19**
    - Communication of Recommendations to the Candidates ..... 19
- SECTION 6: RECONSIDERATION/APPEALS OF NEGATIVE DECISIONS ..... 19**
  - A. PROCEDURAL IRREGULARITIES ..... 19**
  - B. APPEAL ..... 19**
- SECTION 7: EXCLUSIONS ..... 19**
  - A. LECTURERS ..... 19**



**SECTION 8: NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE DELIBERATIONS ..... 19**

**SECTION 1: PRIOR TO PROMOTION REVIEW IN THE CLINICAL NON-TENURE TRACK**

Campus policy for the [Annual Evaluation of Faculty at UIC](#), requires that annual faculty performance evaluations are conducted by the unit executive officer in each consecutive year prior to the academic year in which the case is submitted. This policy is important for faculty because it provides a means for the faculty member to receive feedback from the unit executive officer on performance in the relevant areas of teaching, research, and service.

**A. 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.

**B. TRACK SWITCHING**

**1. 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 Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The campus does not normally permit candidates to be considered for promotion until they have been in the track for at least two years.

**2. 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 4<sup>th</sup> year of its probationary period. The campus does not normally permit candidates to be considered for promotion until they have been in the track for at least two years.



## **SECTION 2: THE PROMOTION REVIEW**

### **A. GENERAL**

#### **1. Norms and Criteria**

Each college and academic unit is required to make transparent to all faculty the P&T norms and criteria specific to the discipline. College and unit/departmental norms should be sent to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs annually to account for any changes or updates. These norms should be followed accordingly at the various levels of review.

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

#### **2. Confidentiality**

The Promotion and Tenure Process and its associated Promotion and Tenure Dossier is a confidential process. The dossier is a confidential written document that is subject to the guidelines for maintaining confidentiality outlined herein. Similarly, the case review/deliberations process and outcomes are confidential and subject to said guidelines. Any verbal or written communication involving the contents of the dossier, including, without limitation, details about the case and the status of the case at any given stage of the case preparation, review, and disclosure process must be kept confidential between the relevant/privileged parties unless otherwise noted in these guidelines.

### **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.). For candidates having a joint appointment in IGPA, the Director of IGPA will serve in the capacity of the unit executive officer, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs will serve in the capacity of the College Dean.

### **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**

### **1. Types of Faculty Eligible to Vote**

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.

#### **a. Exceptions**

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). In exceptional circumstances where a committee needs to be augmented in response to a shortage of eligible voters or for other substantial and valid reasons, tenured senior faculty with Emeritus status who are currently employed or have been rehired may be invited for participation. When special circumstances in a particular unit provide good reasons for allowing these types of other senior professors a vote on P&T advisory committees, or there is substantial and valid reason to reconfigure a unit or college P&T advisory committee, the unit head or chair may petition the college Dean in writing to write a letter of request to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to allow for such exceptional procedures. The Dean may also initiate this request in writing to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, independently, should circumstances warrant such action.



Eligible voters must further satisfy the following conditions:

**b. Rank**

**Only faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate would be promoted 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 as 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.

**2. 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 is eligible to participate. Failure of an eligible member to vote at this lowest level due to absence at the committee meeting on which a voter is a member 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. However, if an eligible faculty member is not a member of a particular voting committee at a lower level, he or she then becomes eligible to vote at the next-highest level. Not being a member of a voting committee should not be confused with abstaining from a vote at the lower level or with being absent from the deliberations at the lower level.

**a. Voting for Jointly-Appointed Faculty**

Additionally, voting faculty who hold paid joint appointments (non-zero percentage) 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. This includes faculty who have a joint appointment in IGPA.

**3. Voting and Dual Relationships (Family Members, Collaborators, and Former Mentors)**

**a. 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."

#### **b. Internal Collaborations**

UIC faculty members who are in a relationship characterized by substantial academic collaboration with a candidate under P&T review must recuse themselves from voting or otherwise endorsing or not endorsing the candidate for promotion and/or tenure at any level. For example, the term "substantial collaboration" between a candidate and another faculty member includes a high volume of any of the following activities (so much so as the candidate's independence is in question): the faculty member co-authored a paper with the candidate that is of particular import in the discipline; the faculty member co-authored a book with the candidate; the faculty member served as a co-investigator on a grant with the candidate; and/or the faculty member appeared as a co-author on many of the candidate's peer-reviewed papers. These, and similar activities that demonstrate substantial collaboration disallow the faculty member from voting on the candidate's case at any level. Additionally, if a UIC faculty member was the candidate's primary PhD adviser or the candidate's primary post-doc adviser, he or she should not vote on the case at any level. Instead, UIC faculty who are academic collaborators with a candidate are encouraged to submit letters of collaboration as commentary regarding the independence of the candidate

#### **4. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees**

Departmental bylaws or other documents covering P&T policies and procedures may be accessed by the Unit Executive Officer to establish a promotion and tenure committee, consisting of at least three eligible faculty and where more than three eligible faculty exist, a seventy-five percent quorum is required to review and vote on promotion and tenure cases. A college dean may apply an exception when warranted. In small units (those with fewer than three eligible voters) the Dean, with appropriate advice, must establish a promotion and tenure committee that includes faculty from other departmental or campus (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, the rationale for the vote must be addressed in the letter of the unit executive officer or the unit P&T committee.

#### **5. College Promotion and Tenure Committees**

College bylaws or other documents covering P&T policies and procedures may be accessed by the Dean to establish a college promotion and tenure committee consisting of at least three eligible faculty and where more than three eligible faculty exist, a seventy-five percent quorum is required, in addition to an executive committee (where appropriate), to review and vote on promotion and tenure cases. A college dean may apply an exception when warranted. In small colleges where there are fewer than three eligible voters on the college committee, the Dean, with appropriate advice, must establish a promotion and tenure committee that includes faculty from other campus (UIC) units who are qualified by expertise and who meet all other eligibility standards according to the rules outlined above. In any instance of a split vote, the rationale for the vote must be addressed by the dean or the College P&T Committee.





## **6. Unit Executive Officers and Deans**

Unit executive officers and Deans 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 (i.e., endorsements or non-endorsements), with accompanying written rationales.

## **7. Disagreement between Promotion and Tenure Committee and Unit Executive Officer/Dean**

If there is 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. Similarly, 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 basis of its vote. In either case, this may not become apparent until after the unit executive officer or unit dean renders judgment of the candidate. Disagreement is defined as either a majority negative vote (>50% negative) by the committee accompanied by a positive endorsement from the Unit Executive Officer or Dean, or a negative endorsement from the Unit Executive Officer or Dean and a majority positive vote (> 50%) by the committee. These letters should be inserted following the evaluations of the unit executive officer and/or unit dean, as appropriate.

## **8. 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 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 Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs/Vice chancellor for health affairs (applicable to health sciences colleges) 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:

1. Department Vote and Recommendation of Unit Executive Officer(s) - communicated to candidate by the unit executive officer(s)
2. College Vote and Recommendation of the Dean - communicated to candidate by the Dean with copy to unit executive officer(s).
3. Campus P&T Committee vote - communicated to the candidate by the Dean with copy to unit executive officer(s).



4. Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs/ Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs (applicable to health sciences colleges) 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 Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs/ Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs (applicable to health sciences colleges), and the Graduate College Dean, the Chancellor's recommendation is sent directly to the candidate with copies to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs/ Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs (applicable to health sciences colleges), 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 Trustee's 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 Provost and 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.

### **G. WITHDRAWAL FROM THE REVIEW PROCESS**

A faculty member may choose to withdraw from the review at any point of the process. In that case, the papers will not go to the next level of review. The faculty member must make his or her intention to withdraw in writing to the unit executive officer. Following the withdrawal notification from the faculty member, the unit executive officer must send a Withdrawal Confirmation letter (templates below) to notify them of the action that will be taken. Such withdrawal may take place without prejudice to a *de novo* review in some future review cycle

*Dear \_\_\_\_\_:*

*This letter confirms your request, dated XX/XX/20XX, to withdraw from the Promotion and Tenure review process during the AY XX-XX cycle.*

*CC: Faculty Affairs*

### **H. 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 may 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 must incorporate this new material into the candidate's papers for submission to any further levels of review.

### **SECTION 3: UNIT LEVEL REVIEWS**

A copy of the most recent document(s) covering Unit P&T Norms and Criteria, including any reference thereof in the unit/college bylaws, should be updated as appropriate, on file, and submitted by the Unit Executive Officer for filing by the line college and by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (OVPPFA). The line college should be notified whenever changes are made in the document and the college should inform OVPPFA in accordance with campus deadlines, published in the annual [P&T Calendar of Dates and Deadlines](#). If there have been no changes since the previous year, please send an email to the Campus P&T Coordinator, Faizan H. Abid ([fabid2@uic.edu](mailto:fabid2@uic.edu)), stating the date of the bylaws currently in use in your College.

#### **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.). For candidates having a joint appointment in IGPA, the Director of IGPA will serve in the capacity of the unit executive officer, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs will serve in the capacity of the College Dean.

#### **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 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 must be prepared by the 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 must 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. If more than 5 letters are solicited and more than 5 letters are received, all letters received must be included in the dossier. The letters in this section are to be solicited by the unit executive officer or paper preparer designee, **not** by the candidate.

### **1. Selection of Referees for the External Evaluation**

Because the choice of external referees 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 biographical paragraph about the reviews.

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 some kind of an association with the candidate. Such deviations must be explained in detail. Simply saying "the field is too small" does not constitute an adequate justification.

## 2. Objectivity and Conflicts of Interest

The University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) wishes to ensure that the referees are as impartial as possible. Therefore, unit executive officer's should ask ***referees if they have a past or current relationship with the candidate that may influence the extent to which the referee can be impartial, or which may give the perception of an influence, or that gives referee a stake in the outcome of the case.*** Such relationships may include but are not limited to:

- Serving as the candidate's Mentor (e.g. Ph.D. supervisor; dissertation committee member; post-doctoral advisor; clinical supervisor)
- Serving as the candidate's Trainee (e.g. student; post-doctoral fellow; resident)
- Referees who have had a **substantial collaboration** with the candidate (non-substantive collaborations include providing and/or sharing supplies, equipment, facilities<sup>1</sup>; co-organizing professional meetings, etc.)
- 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.

## 3. The Solicitation of Referees

It is recommended that this be done in two stages:

### a. Information that should be sent to referees in the first stage

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](#) of the Guidelines).

---

<sup>1</sup> Such as reagents; animal models, antibodies for some fields including biological and health disciplines.



**b. Information that should be sent to referees in the second stage**

The second contact is the official 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.

(See Sample B in [Part III, Section 7B](#) of the Guidelines).

**4. Solicitation of Letters of External Evaluation :**

The solicitation of letters of evaluation must come from the unit executive officer or paper preparer designee, 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 make note 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 a critical evaluation of the candidate's body of work since the last personnel action period 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.

Your solicitation letter should include the following (for full text see Sample B in [Part III, Section 7B](#) of the Guidelines).

- *Note that you are evaluating the scholarship since the previous personnel action and not necessarily the number of calendar years. This is important in cases being reviewed for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Professor.*
- *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.*
- *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 curriculum vitae. What we seek is a substantive evaluation of the scholarly component and qualifications for promotion to the proposed rank. 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.*



## **5. Letters from Collaborators/Co-Authors**

Unit executive officer(s) or paper preparer designees must solicit letters from individuals who have had a substantial collaboration with the candidate. Letters from those individuals should document the contributions of the candidate to the joint work. These letters should **not** be included among the letters of external evaluation. They must instead be solicited by the unit executive officer and included in P&T 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 delay or call for future review. (See Sample Letter C, in [Part III, Section 7C](#) of the Guidelines)

## **6. 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 Section 2 [J.New Information](#).

## **7. Translation of Letters of External Evaluation**

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.

## **8. E-Mailed Letters of External Evaluation**

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. For communications sent electronically, three types of signatures are acceptable:

1. A scanned letter on letterhead with evidence of a previous wet signature sent as an attachment in PDF format.
2. A scanned letter on letterhead with evidence of an electronically embedded signature, sent as an attachment in WORD format.
3. If the referee chooses to send an email with the evaluation/comments embedded within the email, the email must contain an electronic signature along with the referee's title and institutional information (name of institution, address, phone number, etc.). This should be sent from an institutional email account.

## **9. Protecting the Identity of External Referees**

Since all letters of invitation for external referees should state that the identity of the referee will be kept confidential, **the identity and/or institutional affiliation of the referees must never be disclosed to the candidate. Similarly, the identify and/or institutional affiliation should not be disclosed in any associated letters of evaluation from Unit Executive Officers, paper preparer designees, voting committee representatives, or within any other administrative correspondence.** If it is necessary to refer to an external letter of evaluation in a dossier, then language such as “one referee noted...” and “in the opinion of referee #1” should be used. 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) must solicit letters from individuals who have had a substantial collaboration with the candidate. Letters from those individuals should document the contributions of the candidate to the joint work. These letters should NOT be treated as one-and-the-same as the external letters of evaluation.

### **H. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Candidates for promotion and tenure must be informed in writing of the outcome of the vote on their cases 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 candidate, at his or her request, is entitled to a brief, verbally-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 by-laws, or other documents covering P&T, should be on file in the OVPFA, and any revisions affecting voting privileges in the college or departments should be forwarded to the OVPFA **annually and in accordance with the [P&T Calendar of Dates and Deadlines](#)**. If there have been no changes since the previous year, please send an email to the Campus P&T Coordinator, Faizan H. Abid ([fabid2@uic.edu](mailto:fabid2@uic.edu)), stating the date of the bylaws currently in use in your College.

### **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-tenured 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-tenured 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.). For candidates having a joint appointment in IGPA, the Director of IGPA will serve in the capacity of the unit executive officer, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs will serve in the capacity of the College Dean.

#### **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.

##### **1. 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 following the vote of the Campus P&T Committee.

*Sample Letter from Dean for Notification of Campus P&T Committee Vote:*

*Dear \_\_\_\_\_:*

*This letter is to notify you that the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee has reviewed your file. The 27 member committee vote was as follows:*

*\_\_\_yes \_\_\_no \_\_\_ abstain \_\_\_ absent \_\_\_ not eligible*

*Sincerely,*

*Dean*

*cc: Unit Executive Officer(s)*

#### **B. REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION BY THE PROVOST/ VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS/ Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs (applicable to health sciences colleges) AND DEAN OF GRADUATE COLLEGE**

Following the review of the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee, all cases will then be reviewed by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) / Vice Chancellor



for Health Affairs (applicable to health sciences colleges) and the Dean of the Graduate College in light of the entire record of assessment at other levels. The joint recommendation of the Provost and VCAA / Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs (applicable to health sciences colleges) 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 Provost and VCAA / Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs (applicable to health sciences colleges) 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 Non-Health Science Negative Recommendation:***

*Dear \_\_\_\_\_:*

*This letter is to notify you that I have received notification from the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, 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 Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs 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 to the Chancellor by 5:00 pm on (insert date). The Chancellor will notify you of the recommendation to the Board of Trustees by (insert date).  
cc: Unit Executive Officer(s)*

#### ***Sample Letter: To Candidate from Dean for Health Science Negative Recommendation:***

*Dear \_\_\_\_\_:*

*This letter is to notify you that I have received notification from the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs along with the Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs, 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 Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs 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 to the Chancellor by 5:00 pm on (insert date). The Chancellor will notify you of the recommendation to the Board of Trustees by (insert date).  
cc: Unit Executive Officer(s)*



### **C. CHANCELLOR'S 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/APPEALS OF NEGATIVE DECISIONS**

### **A. PROCEDURAL IRREGULARITIES**

A procedural appeal 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 prior to the campus-level reviews by writing to the unit executive officer. If, in the judgement of the unit executive officer, a procedural irregularity is determined to have occurred, the only remedy is the correction of the irregularity. A procedural irregularity alone does not necessarily alter a prior recommendation or vote that was based on an evaluation of the merit of the case. In the case of a procedural irregularity, 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 unit executive officer if a delay is anticipated.

### **B. APPEAL**

**Appeals will only be considered after the Provost and VCAA's recommendation to the Chancellor has been made.** An appeal should be a written argument that focuses on merit. It should make the case that the relevant benchmarks for promotion and/or tenure have been met. Appeals, including supporting documentation, must be made in writing by the candidate and received in the Chancellor's office (2833 UH) by the campus deadline, published in the Calendar of Promotion and Tenure events.

## **SECTION 7: EXCLUSIONS**

### **A. 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.