



**TENURE SYSTEM AND
RESEARCH NON-TENURE TRACK
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
2017-18**

**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. Questions about procedures and instructions for the corresponding forms should be directed toward Andrew Maybach or Faizan H. Abid, Campus P&T Coordinators, in the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs: (312) 413-3470. amayba2@uic.edu or fabid2@uic.edu.



Table of Contents

Table of Contents 2

SECTION 1: PRIOR TO PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW 4

A. The Meaning of Tenure Codes 4

 Tenure Code Table..... 5

B. Rollbacks, Holds, and Modified Duties for Faculty with a New Child 5

 1. Tenure Rollback 6

 2. Tenure Hold..... 6

 3. Modified Duties..... 6

C. PRE-TENURE AND PRE-PROMOTIONAL EVALUATIONS..... 7

 1. Mid-Probationary Reviews for Tenure Track Faculty 7

 2. Pre-Promotional Reviews for Promotions in Rank 8

 a. Review of Research Non-tenure Track Faculty 8

 b. Review of Tenured Faculty for Promotion in Rank to Full Professor..... 8

D. NON-REAPPOINTMENT TO AN ASSISTANT PROFESSOR ON A DEFINITE-TERM APPOINTMENT PRIOR TO THE TENURE CODE 6 YEAR 9

E. TRACK SWITCHING FROM TENURE-TRACK TO NON-TENURE TRACK 9

SECTION 2: THE PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW 10

A. NON-DISCLOSURE..... 10

B. GENERAL 10

 1. Norms and Criteria 10

 2. Confidentiality..... 10

C. JOINT APPOINTMENTS..... 10

D. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS (NON-SALARIED 0% FTE)..... 11

E. PROMOTION IN THE APPROPRIATE TRACK..... 11

F. VOTING RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES 11

 1. Types of Faculty Eligible to Vote 11

 a. Exceptions 12

 b. Rank 12

 2. Lowest Level 12

 a. Voting for Jointly-Appointed Faculty 12

 3. Voting and Dual Relationships (Family Members, Collaborators, and Former Mentors) 13

 a. Family Members..... 13

 b. Internal Collaborations 13

 4. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees 13



5. College Promotion and Tenure Committees 13

6. Unit Executive Officers and Deans 14

7. Disagreement between Promotion and Tenure Committee and Unit Executive Officer/Dean 14

8. Voting in Absentia..... 14

G. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CANDIDATE..... 14

 Debriefing Opportunities 15

H. NON-REAPPOINTMENT IN YEAR 6 OF THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD OR IN THE FINAL YEAR OF “Q” APPOINTMENT 15

 1. NON-REAPPOINTMENT IN YEAR 6 OF THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD 15

 2. NON-REAPPOINTMENT IN THE FINAL YEAR OF “Q” APPOINTMENT..... 16

I. WITHDRAWAL FROM THE REVIEW PROCESS 16

 1. WITHDRAWAL IN YEAR 6 OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD 17

 2. WITHDRAWAL IN FINAL YEAR OF “Q” APPOINTMENT..... 17

 3. WITHDRAWAL FOR EARLY CASES AND FROM ASSOCIATE TO FULL 18

J. NEW INFORMATION 18

SECTION 3: UNIT LEVEL REVIEWS..... 18

A. WHO SHOULD BE REVIEWED..... 18

B. JOINT APPOINTMENTS..... 18

C. TIMETABLE 19

D. RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE CASE..... 19

E. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES AND ACCESS..... 19

F. EXTERNAL EVALUATION..... 20

 1. Selection of Referees for the External Evaluation 20

 2. Objectivity and Conflicts of Interest 21

 3. The Solicitation of Referees 21

 a. Information that should be sent to referees in the first stage..... 21

 b. Information that should be sent to referees in the second stage 22

 4. Solicitation of Letters of External Evaluation 22

 5. Letters from Collaborators/Co-Authors 23

 6. Letters Received After Departmental Review 23

 7. Translation of Letters of External Evaluation 23

 8. E-Mailed Letters of External Evaluation..... 23

 2. A scanned letter on letterhead with evidence of an electronically embedded signature, sent as an attachment in..... 24



9. Protecting the Identity of External Referees 24

G. CANDIDATE'S CONTRIBUTION TO COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH..... 24

H. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS 24

SECTION 4: COLLEGE LEVEL REVIEWS 24

A. COLLEGES NOT ORGANIZED BY DEPARTMENTS..... 25

B. LINE COLLEGE REVIEW 25

C. JOINT APPOINTMENTS..... 25

D. COMMUNICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS 25

SECTION 5: REVIEWS AND COMMUNICATION BEYOND THE COLLEGE..... 25

A. CAMPUS PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE..... 25

1. Communication of Recommendations to the Candidates..... 26

B. REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION BY THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS/ PROVOST, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR HEALTH AFFAIRS, AND DEAN OF GRADUATE COLLEGE..... 26

1. Communication of Recommendations to the Candidates..... 26

C. CHANCELLOR’S REVIEW 27

1. Communication of Recommendations to the Candidates..... 27

SECTION 6: RECONSIDERATION/APPEALS OF NEGATIVE DECISIONS..... 28

D. PROCEDURAL IRREGULARITIES..... 28

E. APPEAL 28

F. PETITION FOR SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEW 28

SECTION 7: EXCLUSIONS 29

A. LECTURERES AND INSTRUCTORS..... 29

SECTION 8: NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE DELIBERATIONS 29

SECTION 1: PRIOR TO PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

The [Annual Evaluation of Faculty at UIC](#) campus policy, 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 particularly important for tenure-track (probationary) 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. In addition, a mid-probationary review is required for all tenure track (probationary) faculty according to the guidelines below (Section 1.C.1).

A. The Meaning of Tenure Codes

A tenure code is a numeric designation indicating the year in which a faculty member is progressing along the tenure clock. At UIC, faculty members advancing to the full tenure



clock must be reviewed at the beginning of the sixth year of employment. According to this full tenure clock, when a faculty member is hired as an assistant professor, the numeric designation given to that person is T1. T1 represents the first year of progress toward tenure. Subsequent numbers are assigned in sequence as the year's progress. See the Tenure Code Table below for an example.

Tenure Code Table

T1 = First year of progress along the tenure clock
T2 = Second year of progress along the tenure clock
T3 = Third year of progress along the tenure clock
T4 = Fourth year of progress along the tenure clock
T5 = Fifth year of progress along the tenure clock
T6 = Sixth year of progress along the tenure clock and year of tenure review
T7 = Terminal year for individuals who are not granted tenure.

1. Expedited Tenure Review: For some faculty, the tenure clock is of shorter duration. For example, if an individual is hired as a T3, he or she begins the tenure clock in the first year of employment as if he or she was in the 3rd year of progress along the tenure clock. Another example concerns those who are hired on Q appointments. A person hired on a Q3 appointment begins his or her clock as if it were the T4th year. The first year of hire for someone on a Q3 appointment is treated as the T-fourth year of progress along the tenure clock. This person only has the 4th and 5th years of the "typical" tenure clock (equivalent to the 1st and 2nd years of appointment) to demonstrate progress along the tenure clock before review. A terminal year is not granted in cases of Q appointments so, if the candidate does not achieve tenure in the 3rd year of his or her appointment, the appointment ends at the end of the 3rd year (equivalent to the T6 year of the "typical" tenure clock).

B. Rollbacks, Holds, and Modified Duties for Faculty with a New Child

An interruption of the probationary period (rollback or hold in the tenure year code) for tenure-track faculty may be granted for one year upon request and approval when an event or compelling circumstance causes substantial impairment of a candidate's ability to pursue his or her teaching, scholarly activities, and/or service. A rollback or hold may also be granted in the event of the birth or adoption of a new child under six years old. If the birth or adoption of a child occurs during the year that the suspension of the probationary time period is requested, then an automatic tenure hold may be granted. A rollback or hold may also be granted in the case of disability or extended and/or severe personal illness. A rollback or hold may also be granted for compelling obligations to a member of the family or household that requires significant time away from University duties. Finally, a rollback or hold may be granted under circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member. . Normally, no more than 2 rollbacks or holds will be granted. Additionally, tenure-track and tenured faculty members at the Assistant, Associate, or full Professor rank who have a new child under the age of 6 in the home may apply for a period of modified teaching duties without a reduction



in effort or salary. Sections D1 – D3 (below) provide links and more information about the tenure rollback, tenure hold, and modified duties policies and procedures.

1. Tenure Rollback

For additional information see the campus [Tenure Rollback](#) policy.

Using the [Tenure Code Table](#) from Section 1.A. of this policy, the following is an example of a tenure clock for a tenure rollback that was requested during the fourth year of a typical T1-T6 Assistant Professor appointment. The qualifying event happened during the third year of employment (see table below for an example).

- T1 = First year of employment, first year of progress along the tenure clock
- T2 = Second year of employment, second year of progress along the tenure clock
- T3 = Third year of employment, third year of progress along the tenure clock, qualifying event occurred.
- T4 = Fourth year of employment, year in which tenure rollback was requested
- T4 = Fifth year of employment, fourth year of progress along the tenure clock.
- T5 = Sixth year of employment, fifth year of progress along the tenure clock
- T6 = Seventh year of employment, sixth year of progress along the tenure clock and year of tenure review
- T7 = Terminal year, if candidate does not achieve tenure

2. Tenure Hold

For additional information see the campus [Tenure Hold](#) policy.

A one-year tenure hold will be automatic for an assistant professor (in the tenure probationary period) who becomes the parent of a child by birth or adoption regardless of whether they take Parental Leave or Family and Medical Leave. This applies to both men and women, and includes same-sex domestic partnerships that are recognized by the University. If the child birth or adoption occurs after the faculty member already has two previous rollbacks or holds, a tenure hold must be requested for any subsequent births or adoptions.

Using the [Tenure Code Table](#) from Section 1.A. of this policy, the following is an example of a tenure clock for a tenure hold that was requested during the third year of a typical T1-T6 Assistant Professor appointment, within the same year as the occurrence of the qualifying event (see table below for an example).

- T1 = First year of employment, first year of progress along the tenure clock
- T2 = Second year of employment, second year of progress along the tenure clock
- T3 = Third year of employment, third year of progress along the tenure clock, year qualifying event occurred
- T3 = Fourth year of employment, third year of progress along the tenure clock
- T4 = Fifth year of employment, fourth year of progress along the tenure clock.
- T5 = Sixth year of employment, fifth year of progress along the tenure clock
- T6 = Seventh year of employment, sixth year of progress along the tenure clock and year of tenure review
- T7 = Terminal year, if candidate does not achieve tenure

3. Modified Duties

For additional information see the campus [Modified Duties](#) policy.

Upon request, tenure-track and tenured faculty members at the Assistant, Associate, or full Professor rank who have a new child under the age of 6 in the home may apply for a



period of modified teaching duties without a reduction in effort or salary. The nature and extent of these modifications must be negotiated between the unit executive officer and the faculty member before beginning the period of modified duties.

C. PRE-TENURE AND PRE-PROMOTIONAL EVALUATIONS

1. Mid-Probationary Reviews for Tenure Track Faculty

All tenure-track faculty should be informed of the mid-probationary review policy by the unit executive officer at the time of initial appointment. The campus [Mid-Probationary Review](#) policy requires that a formal, internal review of tenure-track (probationary) faculty take place **no later** than the mid-point of a faculty member's probationary period on the tenure track at UIC. The only exception to this is when a decision not to retain a faculty member is reached at the level of the recommending unit before the time a formal mid-probationary review is scheduled. For most probationary faculty, this review will occur in their third year at UIC. If a faculty member's initial appointment carried a tenure code higher than "1," the review will fall at a later point in the probationary period, though still before the sixth year review. The intent is to provide an assessment of the faculty member at a date late enough to permit reasonable review of his or her progress toward tenure since the initial appointment, and early enough to give useful guidance to him or her in preparing for any subsequent review. Faculty members may request such a review at any time and should request it if the department fails to undertake a mid-probationary review in a timely fashion. Confirmation that a mid-probationary review is being carried out for a particular faculty member should be recorded on the "Expected Reviews Form" (included under "Downloadable Forms" on the P&T Webpage).

To ensure equity and consistency, each academic unit (normally the department) will establish written procedures for mid-probationary reviews suitable to its own concerns. The use of outside evaluators for the mid-probationary review is at the department's discretion. The campus does not provide any prescribed forms for reporting. The academic unit will be responsible for selecting the format and mechanism of written communication of the review (e.g., a letter to the faculty member), and for the dissemination of procedures to unit faculty early in their employment.

The mid-probationary evaluation should describe the faculty member's progress and performance in the three areas specified in the [Statutes](#): teaching, research (including scholarship and creative activity), and service. The unit executive officer will carry out the mid-probationary review (in consultation with the unit advisory or executive committee). A favorable review may result in recommendation for continued employment, with additional reviews as deemed desirable in subsequent years.

A copy of the written mid-probationary review of the candidate's progress, and the outcome of that review, should be given to the faculty member under review. The faculty member must acknowledge that he/she has received and read a copy of the evaluation with a signature. Evidence of this signature must be received by the Office for Faculty Affairs at the May deadline. The faculty member is then given an opportunity to comment orally or in writing, and any written response by the faculty member will be included as part of the review. The review will be communicated to the Dean for independent review and endorsement status.



As a part of this process, the unit executive officer will make a recommendation to the Dean who will decide whether or not to renew the appointment. The probationary faculty member must be informed of the unit executive Officer's recommendation and the Dean's decision.

A copy of the written review shall be kept on file in the College, and another copy must be forwarded to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs by the campus deadline in May, published in the annual Calendar of Promotion and Tenure events. Additionally, a copy of the mid-probationary review **must be included in the candidate's tenure review P&T dossier when he or she comes up for review.**

For faculty with joint appointments, mid-probationary reviews should be carried out in both/all units. This includes faculty with a joint appointment in the Institute of Government and Public Affairs (IGPA). Additionally, if a faculty member's appointment is changed such that he or she moves from one unit/department into another or assumes a new joint appointment at any time during the probationary period, a new mid-probationary review (or an appropriate equivalent, depending on time of progress along the tenure clock) should be conducted in the new unit as soon as possible.

2. **Pre-Promotional Reviews for Promotions in Rank**

a. **Review of Research Non-tenure Track Faculty**

A Research Assistant or Research Associate Professor may request a departmental review for eligibility for promotion in rank at any time. [The Annual Evaluation of Faculty at UIC](#), or any additional evaluations required by a college or departmental bylaw or policy statement may be treated as an equivalent provided that the process addresses a candidate's questions about eligibility for promotion. If there is disagreement between the candidate and the Unit Executive Officer regarding a candidate's readiness, the Executive Officer should have a candid conversation with the candidate outlining the basis of his or her assessment. If the candidate still wishes to proceed he or she should be reviewed according to the standard procedure.

b. **Review of Tenured Faculty for Promotion in Rank to Full Professor**

A tenured Associate Professor may request a departmental review for eligibility for promotion in rank at any time. [The Annual Evaluation of Faculty at UIC](#), or any additional evaluations required by a college or departmental bylaw or policy statement may be treated as an equivalent provided that the process addresses a candidate's questions about eligibility for promotion. If there is disagreement between the candidate and the Unit Executive Officer regarding a candidate's readiness, the Executive Officer should have a candid conversation with the candidate outlining the basis of his or her assessment. If the candidate still wishes to proceed he or she should be reviewed according to the standard procedure. Tenured Associate Professors are urged to give serious consideration to their Unit Executive Officer's assessment of their readiness before moving forward.



D. NON-REAPPOINTMENT TO AN ASSISTANT PROFESSOR ON A DEFINITE-TERM APPOINTMENT PRIOR TO THE TENURE CODE 6 YEAR

Since a full six-year probationary period is not guaranteed, non-reappointment may be recommended by the unit executive officer (who is normally the head/chair of the unit responsible for academic and personnel issues and who reports directly to the dean of the unit's college/school) at any time during tenure code 1 through 5 years as a result of an unfavorable review. (Statutes: Article X., Section 1b [6]). In any case in which issuing a written notice of non-reappointment is considered, the unit executive officer should consult the unit advisory/executive committee and contact University Counsel.

For a faculty member with a tenure code 1, a written notice of non-reappointment given no later than 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 appointment year with no obligation of an additional terminal year (Statutes: Article X, Section 1b [4]). If a written notice of non-reappointment is given after March 1, it shall be accompanied by an offer of a terminal contract from the Board of Trustees for one additional year of service.

For a faculty member with tenure code 2 to 5, a written notice of non-reappointment shall be accompanied by an offer of a terminal contract from the Board of Trustees for an additional year of service.

When the unit executive officer recommends that a written notice of non-reappointment be issued to an assistant professor on a definite-term appointment prior to the tenure code 6 year, the unit executive officer shall work with the Office of Faculty Affairs to process the change of appointment. Within one week (seven calendar days) of the date of the recommendation by the unit executive officer to issue a written notice of non-reappointment, the faculty member may respond with a written resignation effective at the end of the current appointment year; otherwise a terminal contract must be offered for the following academic year.

The following is an example of a letter of Notification of Non-Reappointment:

Dear [Name of Faculty Member]:

I am writing to notify you that I have recommended a notice of non-reappointment to be accompanied by an offer of a terminal contract from the University of Illinois Board of Trustees be issued for academic year August 16, xxxx through August 15, xxxx. Please note that if you wish to do so, you have the option to resign your position effective the end of the current contract year, August 15, xxxx. Notice of resignation must be provided in writing to me within one week (seven calendar days) after the date of this letter.

E. TRACK SWITCHING FROM TENURE-TRACK TO 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 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 his or her career direction has changed. Requests for track switching from tenure-track to 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, unless an exception has been granted by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. To petition for such an exception, a letter of request must be submitted by the College.

SECTION 2: THE PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

A. NON-DISCLOSURE

At all stages of the tenure review process and in any of the review materials, including mid-probationary reports, it must be emphasized that reviewers should evaluate the candidate's dossier on the basis of her or his performance since the previous personnel action. The number of calendar years preceding the time of review shall not be considered in evaluation for promotion and tenure at any rank. Under no circumstance should a tenure rollback, tenure hold, or a granted modification of teaching duties be considered as a criterion for evaluation or discussed at any level of review or deliberation, including the mid-probationary review. Discussion of the reason or reasons a given faculty member was granted a tenure rollback, hold, or modified duties is not permitted.

B. 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 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

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.

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 vote upon and recommend promotion and/or tenure in their respective units, and the unit executive officers should each complete the Evaluation from the Unit Executive Officer statement in the P&T Forms. For candidates having a joint appointment in two (or more) different colleges, the appropriate faculty committees of the colleges should independently vote upon and recommend promotion and/or tenure in their respective colleges and each dean must complete the Evaluation from the College Dean statement in the P&T Forms. 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. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS (NON-SALARIED 0% FTE)

Although no formal review is required, a letter is required from the unit executive officer (from the courtesy unit) giving support to the promotion with a continued courtesy appointment. The letter may be brief and should be in the format of the unit executive officer's letter of justification in the standard P&T papers. It should be inserted in the specified section in the P&T papers.

E. 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.

F. 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 Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Provost to allow for such exceptional procedures. The Dean may also initiate this request in writing to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Provost, 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 that 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 support as commentary regarding the independence of the candidate and/or quality of work.

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 into Part V: Evaluations, section of the dossier forms, 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.

G. 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 must be communicated by the appropriate executive officer to the candidate promptly and in writing immediately following



each stage of the review process. Until that time, voting outcomes for each case must be kept strictly confidential.

During the annual Promotion and Tenure cycle, the case notification process is as follows:

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

Following the recommendations of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Chancellor's recommendation to the BOT 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 Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the Dean(s), 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, verbally-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 verbal debriefing is the responsibility of the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, typically administered via the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Similar to the debriefing at the earlier levels, this verbal debriefing is to be brief and general so as not to invite detailed rejoinder or debate. If papers are withdrawn earlier, the office at the highest level of review (e.g., department or line college) is responsible for final verbal debriefing. All such debriefings must preserve confidentiality with respect to the identity of the referees, those writing departmental or college committee letters, and any other confidential participants submitting written documentation or participating in any of the deliberations, voting, or discussions.

H. NON-REAPPOINTMENT IN YEAR 6 OF THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD OR IN THE FINAL YEAR OF "Q" APPOINTMENT

1. NON-REAPPOINTMENT IN YEAR 6 OF THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD:

If a faculty member in Year 6 of the probationary period is not recommended for indefinite tenure and promotion at the end of the review, the University of Illinois Statutes require that a written notice of non-reappointment be given to the faculty



member and be accompanied by an offer of a terminal contract from the Board of Trustees for the following academic year. The faculty member may alternatively choose to resign at the end of the appointment year.

Upon receipt of the Chancellor's decision, unit executive officers who have faculty in Year 6 of the probationary period who are not recommended for indefinite tenure and promotion must issue to the candidate the following letter:

Sample Letter to be Used Regarding Negative Recommendation from the Chancellor for Year 6 candidates: (To Candidate from Unit Executive Officer):

Dear _____:
I am in receipt of the copy of the Chancellor's notification to you of his/her decision concerning your case for promotion and tenure indicating that he/she will recommend to the Board of Trustees that you be issued a terminal contract for academic year August 16, xxxx through August 15, xxxx.

Please note that if you wish to do so, you have the option to resign your position effective the end of the current year, August 15, xxxx. Notice of resignation must be provided in writing to me within one week (seven calendar days) after the date of this letter.

*cc: Dean
Faculty Affairs*

2. NON-REAPPOINTMENT IN THE FINAL YEAR OF “Q” APPOINTMENT

A “Q” appointment provides an appointment at the rank of associate professor or professor with an initial defined probationary period before review for indefinite tenure. If the review indicates that the record does not warrant indefinite tenure, then the unit executive officer must notify the candidate of the end of their appointment effective the end of the year, as stated in their Notification of Appointment. The University of Illinois Statutes do not require that Associate Professors or Professors on "Q" appointments be issued a terminal contract for the following academic year.

Sample Letter to be Used Regarding Negative Recommendation from the Chancellor for “Q” appointment candidates: (To Candidate from Unit Executive Officer):

Dear _____:
I am in receipt of the copy of the Chancellor's notification to you of his/her decision concerning your case for promotion and tenure. In accordance with the terms set forth in your Notification of Appointment, your current appointment with the University of Illinois will terminate at the end of the current academic year on August 15, 20XX.

*cc: Dean
Faculty Affairs*

I. 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.

1. WITHDRAWAL IN YEAR 6 OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD

Once a faculty member withdraws and the Withdrawal Confirmation letter has been sent, the unit executive officer will then recommend that a written notice of non-reappointment be issued to the faculty member and be accompanied by an offer of a terminal contract from the Board of Trustees for the following academic year. Within one week (seven calendar days) of the date of the recommendation by the unit executive officer to issue a written notice of non-reappointment, the faculty member may respond with a written resignation effective the end of the current appointment year. For example: a departmental vote in November for a candidate in his or her T6 year is negative. The candidate withdraws from the review. The P&T dossier will not be forwarded to the College. The unit executive officer issues a withdrawal confirmation letter. Once the withdrawal confirmation has been sent the unit executive officer recommends that a written notice of non-reappointment be issued to the faculty member and be accompanied with an offer for a terminal contract for the following Academic Year. Alternatively, the faculty member may elect to submit a letter of resignation within a week (seven calendar days) of the date of the recommendation. The resignation must be effective no later than August 15 (end of the current appointment year). If the faculty member does not submit a letter of resignation, a terminal contract will be issued by the Board of Trustees for the following academic year.

Withdrawal Confirmation for Assistant Professor (Year 6):

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. Based on this action, I am asking the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois to issue you a terminal contract for academic year 20XX-20XX.

CC: Faculty Affairs

2. WITHDRAWAL IN FINAL YEAR OF “Q” APPOINTMENT

A faculty member on a “Q” appointment withdrawing from the review process will end his or her appointment effective the end of the current appointment year. The University Statutes do not require that Associate Professors or Professors on a “Q” appointment be issued a terminal contract for the following academic year.

Withdrawal Confirmation Template for Faculty on “Q” Appointment:

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. Based on the terms of your “Q” appointment, your last day of employment with the University will be 8/15/XX.

CC: Faculty Affairs



3. WITHDRAWAL FOR EARLY CASES AND FROM ASSOCIATE TO FULL

The option of withdrawal 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.

J. 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 (OVPFA). The line college should be notified whenever changes are made in the document and the college should inform OVPFA 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 Coordinators, Andrew Maybach (amayba2@uic.edu) and Faizan H. Abid (fabid2@uic.edu), stating the date of the bylaws currently in use in your College.

A. WHO SHOULD BE REVIEWED

All tenure code 6 faculty and faculty who are beginning the final year of a Q appointment must undergo university review for promotion and tenure unless they are resigning at the end of that year. Unit executive officers should also meet with all assistant and associate professors on a regular basis to discuss their progress for the purpose of determining when a review for promotion and/or tenure would be appropriate. Faculty should be notified by the Unit Executive Officer 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 and/or tenure 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, in addition to the appropriate departmental



committees, independently recommend promotion and/or tenure 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, accuracy, and confidentiality of the papers (i.e., serves in the role of paper preparer), unless the dean assigns someone else the responsibility. In such cases of reassignment, this individual is then referred to as the paper preparer designee. Under no circumstance should anyone serve as paper preparer if, for example, the candidate has a history of a substantial collaborative scholarly relationship with the unit executive officer, in cases where nepotism may be implicated, or in cases where other valid reasons exist. In these cases, the Dean should write a letter to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs indicating that a re-assignment is necessary, and briefly explaining the rationale for that reassignment (with supporting documentation). In order to serve as the paper preparer, the unit executive officer or designee 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. In other cases where the Unit Executive Officer is eligible to vote without conflict but a separate paper preparer has been assigned for other reasons that are consistent with unit bylaws, the Unit Executive Officer remains responsible for preparing the statement of endorsement or non-endorsement and for signing that endorsement on the dossier cover sheet. By signing the cover sheet, the Unit Executive Officer or paper preparer designee assumes full responsibility for the accuracy and confidentiality of the contents of the dossier.

(Units not organized as departments should follow the guidelines in Section 4: College Level Reviews).

E. CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES AND ACCESS

The candidate is responsible for furnishing the Unit Executive Officer/paper preparer with the information which is required to complete the non-confidential aspects of the dossier/forms and for forwarding the case to the Unit Executive Officer/paper preparer. The candidate 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 home unit must provide all candidates an opportunity to review all **non-evaluative (i.e., non-confidential)** sections of the dossier. Candidates are not permitted to read external letters of evaluation and any internal evaluative statements, including, but not limited to the unit executive officer's statement, the statement from members of a departmental, college, or campus voting committee, letters from collaborators, or other types of reviews that may be deemed confidential by the unit or college bylaws. Candidates are not permitted access to the contents of external letters of evaluation **in any form** (e.g., redacted or otherwise).

Any candidate who disagrees with how the non-evaluative (non-confidential) sections of the papers are presented may add a clarification statement to be included in the promotion papers. On the cover page of the dossier, **the candidate must attest with a signature that the non-evaluative (non-confidential) sections are accurate.** Unit executive officers (or paper preparer designees) are responsible for confirming the accuracy of the non-evaluative (non-confidential) aspects of the dossier through a careful and thorough review of all contents. By signing the cover page, the Unit Executive Officer or paper preparer designee attests to the accuracy of the candidate's self-representation regarding academic history and achievement within dossier, to the best of his or her knowledge.

F. EXTERNAL EVALUATION

In evaluating a candidate's scholarship, the Unit Executive Officer or paper preparer designee responsible for the case must obtain a written evaluation from **no fewer than 5** members of the relevant profession(s) or discipline(s) who have not had a close association or academic collaboration with the candidate. For Research Non-Tenure System candidates, the Unit Executive Officer or paper preparer designee responsible for the case must obtain a written evaluation from **no fewer than 3** members of the relevant profession(s) or discipline(s) who have not had a close association or academic collaboration with the candidate. 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 from strong departments at major research institutions, such as those typically found among Research 1, AAU, or premier foreign institutions. All referees from universities must be full professors or equivalent (for example Readers at a British University) with outstanding scholarly accomplishment in the candidate's field.
- If referees are from industry or government, they should be of a similar stature to a full professor at a major research institution, and this should be justified in the 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 5 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, facilities¹; 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 8 potential referees may need to be contacted until a pool of at least 5 willing, objective referees is

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

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).

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*, current research statement, and a sample of recent publications or equivalent scholarly works since the last personnel action, any work(s) in press, and a copy of the unit/department norms and standards for promotion. Where appropriate to the discipline, URL's for submissions to an electronic archive or online journal may be used instead of physical copies of the papers, if this is acceptable to the referee. (See attached 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 whether or not the award of tenure is involved. The tone of the letter should be neutral and should not indicate the desired outcome of the process. Solicitation letters to referees should **not** include language to suggest that the candidate can see the letters with the name and institution removed. Referees should be strongly encouraged to provide a critical evaluation 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 on the number of calendar years. For cases being reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor, our campus has a tenure rollback policy that is granted on a case-by-case basis after review. Tenure rollbacks, as they affect time-to-tenure should not be considered in your evaluation. Equally, the number of years taken to advance from Associate to full Professor should not be considered a criterion for evaluation. Cases should be evaluated on the basis of impact and merit, as defined by the norms established by the unit(s) and college(s) to which the candidate is appointed.*
- *Discuss the candidate's work in a critical fashion commenting on the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarship.*

- *Comment on the volume of the candidate's scholarly activities relative to the standards in the field.*
- *Remark on the quality of the publishing outlets and the source of funding when such is not obvious.*
- *Estimate his/her standing in the field, and compare the candidate with other faculty of roughly the same cohort.*
- *Please note that we do not ask you to make a recommendation regarding promotion itself, since that decision will be based partly on considerations such as teaching and service. Nor are we asking for a summary of the 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)/Equivalent must solicit an attestation for candidates who have had a substantial collaboration with a senior scholar or investigator since the last personnel action period. This requirement applies only to tenure-system assistant professors and to associate professors seeking tenure (i.e. associate professors with Q-appointments only). It does not apply to non-tenure system faculty or those seeking promotion to full professor. Attestations from collaborators should utilize the “Collaborator Attestation Form” included in the forms and also in the instructions for the preparer (Part III, Section 7C). The form allows for documentation of the contributions of the candidate to each joint work with the collaborator listed in the dossier (i.e., every book, monograph, publication, patent, grant or contract). 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 the Collaborator Attestation Form, in [Part III, Section 7C](#) Instructions for the Preparer.)

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 [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 attestations from individuals who have had a substantial collaboration with the candidate. Attestations from those individuals should document the contributions of the candidate to the joint work. These attestations 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 accord 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 Coordinators, Andrew Maybach (amayba2@uic.edu) and Faizan H. Abid (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. 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. 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 and tenure 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 and/or tenure 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 and/or tenure 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 Institute of Government and Public Affairs (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 and tenure must be informed in writing of the outcome of the vote on their case at each level of the review. The vote of the college(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, verbally-rendered explanation from his or her unit executive officer of the rationale for the recommendation.

SECTION 5: REVIEWS AND COMMUNICATION BEYOND THE COLLEGE

A. CAMPUS PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

After the department and line college reviews, all cases will be submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs 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 provided to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs/Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs (applicable to health sciences colleges) and Dean of the Graduate College for cases satisfying one of two conditions: (a) fewer than 75% of members of the campus promotion and tenure committee voted positively, and/or (b) there was at least one negative vote or endorsement at a previous level.



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

cc: Unit Executive Officer(s)

B. REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION BY THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS/ PROVOST, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR HEALTH AFFAIRS, AND DEAN OF GRADUATE COLLEGE

Following review of the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee, all cases are then reviewed by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA), the Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs (VCHA) and the Dean of the Graduate College. This review is conducted in light of the entire record of assessment at all of the other levels. The joint recommendation of the VCAA and Provost, VCHA, 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).

1. Communication of Recommendations to the Candidates

The recommendations of the VCAA and Provost, the VCHA, 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 Positive 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, support your case for promotion to (insert appropriate faculty title).

The Chancellor will notify you of the final recommendation to the Board of Trustees by (insert date).

cc: Unit Executive Officer(s)

Sample Letter: To Candidate from Dean for Health Science Positive 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, support your case for



promotion to (insert appropriate faculty title). The Chancellor will notify you of the final recommendation to the Board of Trustees by (insert date).

cc: Unit Executive Officer(s)

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.

1. 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

D. 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.

E. APPEAL

Appeals will only be considered after the VCAA and Provost'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.

F. 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 cited in the sixth-year review. To obtain a seventh-year review, the unit executive officer should petition the Dean who, upon concurrence, will submit the request to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Approval at the campus level is required to proceed further. Such approval is not automatic.

If a seventh year review is granted by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the candidate, unit executive officer, and Dean must submit a letter that addresses concerns raised in the sixth-year review. This information is either accepted or denied by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. If candidates who are re-evaluated in the terminal (formally called T-7) year are not supported for promotion, their appointment will last until the end of the current appointment year. In other words, they will not receive an additional year beyond the 7th year.



SECTION 7: EXCLUSIONS

A. LECTURERS AND INSTRUCTORS

Promotions from the rank of lecturer to senior lecturer or from instructor to senior instructor do not require campus-level review. Similarly, promotions from any of the lecturer or instructor ranks to that of assistant professor do not require campus-level review.

SECTION 8: NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE DELIBERATIONS

The foregoing policies and procedures are designed to ensure that candidates for P&T are provided with appropriate disclosure about the outcomes of their cases following each level of review while simultaneously protecting the confidentiality of voting members and the relevant (endorsement-level) administrators at each level of review. These procedures and the confidentiality requirements outlined herein were designed to enable voting members and relevant (endorsement-level) administrator's ability to conduct candid evaluations and discussions of each case. Any instance of actual or perceived attempts to sway a decision on behalf of (or against) a particular candidate are prohibited. Actual or perceived attempts to sway a decision on behalf of, or against, a particular candidate may include, but are not limited to, off-protocol telephone calls, emails, or other communications to any administrator or individual faculty members of review committees. Additionally, urging a particular position in a given case and seeking specific information at an untimely point in the process is prohibited. 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.