

**ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ACTION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, 1991-92**

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide direction and guidance with respect to the promotion and tenure process during the 1991-92 academic year, including a timetable for the various stages of the process. Please review this document carefully before beginning preparation of promotion and tenure papers, and if possible, early in the candidate review process. Particular attention should be paid to Sections II.A. regarding **Voting Rights and Privileges**, and II.B(2)-(5) concerning solicitation of referred letters.

**Confidentiality and Non-Interference in Proceedings**

The attached guidelines are intended to insure that candidates for promotion and tenure are periodically provided with information about their case, while simultaneously guaranteeing candid discussions at all levels of review. Unfortunately, nearly every year there are at least one or two recorded 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 or partisans 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 either to divulge confidential information or to 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 unofficial suasion is that it will affect a case negatively, inasmuch as such informal representations suggest that the case cannot withstand the test of scrutiny under the normal review process.

\*\*\*\*\*

For further information or explanation of any of these guidelines, please contact the office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at 3-3462.

## I. Advance Notification of Cases

Each Dean or Director is to forward to Academic Affairs a list of promotion and tenure cases, including any that may lead to non-retention, that will be reviewed in the units within the College, School, or Center during the current academic year. A form is provided indicating the appropriate format for this listing, ('Anticipated Personnel Actions 1991-92'). This list should include both personnel actions in the academic and academic clinical ranks, and mid-probation reviews. In addition to the candidate's name and (where applicable) department, the proposed personnel action (promotion, promotion and tenure, tenure in rank, non-retention) and, in the case of probationary faculty, the individual's year of service should be included. All units are reminded that review and action is required in cases which are labelled as tenure-code "6" in AY 1991-92. The information should be in this office no later than Monday, November 4, 1991.

## II. The Promotion and Tenure Process

The review of cases at the college level and above should proceed with the use of the attached forms. In proposing and reviewing the promotion of academic staff members, in the words of the Statutes, "special consideration shall be given to the following:

- (1) teaching ability and performance;
- (2) research ability and achievement;
- (3) ability and performance in continuing education, public service, committee work, and special assignments designed to promote the quality and effectiveness of academic programs and services." (See Article IX, Section 3e.).

### A. Voting Rights and Privileges

The University of Illinois Statutes (Art.II., Section 3, Para. (1), define the faculty as "those members of the academic staff in that unit with the rank or title of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor who are tenured or receiving probationary credit toward tenure and those administrators in the direct line of responsibility for academic affairs.... Administrative staff not in the direct line of responsibility for academic affairs are members of the faculty only if they also hold faculty appointments." Regarding the voting rights of the faculty, the Statutes continue: "The bylaws of any academic unit may further mandate a minimum percent faculty appointment in that unit for specified faculty privileges, such as voting."

This language in the Statutes constitutes the basis of

voting rights in promotion and tenure cases. A faculty member or administrator must be tenured for some percentage of time in an academic unit in order to have promotion and tenure voting privileges in that unit. The unit, department or college, may further restrict such voting privileges to those tenured at or above some specified percentage of time, e.g., fifty percent, but this must be specified in the unit bylaws. Barring such specific language, those tenured for any percentage of time are eligible to vote on promotion and tenure cases, if they satisfy the following conditions.

(1) Only faculty at rank(s) above the current rank of the candidate may vote at any level in the promotion and tenure process. Thus, only full professors may vote on the promotion of an associate professor to the rank of full professor, and only associate and full professors may vote on the promotion of an assistant professor to the rank of associate professor. Some colleges may wish to include in their bylaws a provision which allows untenured senior faculty to vote on the award of rank, but only faculty holding tenure are eligible to vote on the granting of tenure. (Where separate votes on the award of tenure and the award of rank are held, the promotion and tenure papers must record these separate votes.) College bylaws 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) 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 first level of review in which the voter participates, e.g., a faculty member in a department who also serves on a college executive or promotion committee must vote at the department level or a faculty member who serves on both a line college committee and the Graduate College Executive Committee must vote in the line college. Such individuals should be listed as "not voting" in the vote record of the subsequent committees on which they serve.

(3) Departmental bylaws may establish a promotion and tenure committee, consisting of some subset of the tenured faculty, to review and vote on promotion and tenure cases. This is typically done in very large departments. In small units, with less than three eligible voters, according to the rules outlined above, the dean, with appropriate advise, may establish a promotion and tenure committee including faculty from other UIC units who are qualified by expertise and meet all other eligibility standards.

(4) Line officers, i.e., department heads and chairs and college deans, may not vote on promotion and tenure cases in the committee review process. Their role is to take the votes of the relevant committees under advisement and to make independent recommendations with accompanying rationales on the promotion and tenure forms. Departmental chairs who are bound by departmental bylaws to carry out the personnel decisions of their executive or promotion and tenure committee (with which they may personally disagree) are permitted to vote as members of the committee.

(5) 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."

(6) Voting in absentia is not permitted. Only faculty able to be present during the balloting on promotion and tenure questions are eligible to vote.

If special circumstances in a particular academic unit make it difficult to conform to the above guidelines, that unit may petition the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to approve exceptional procedures.

A copy of the most current bylaws of each college should be on file in the Office of Academic Affairs, and any revisions affecting voting privileges should be reported immediately. Departmental bylaws should also be on file, if steps have been taken to incorporate specific provisions governing promotion and tenure voting privileges.

## **B. Preparing the Papers**

Instructions imbedded in the P & T forms offer most of the specific guidance necessary to prepare a case for review. Some additional instructions are necessary, however.

(1) **Who prepares the papers?** The department or unit head, or another member of the department faculty who is senior in rank to the candidate (as may be designated according to departmental bylaws or customary practice) takes responsibility for the preparation of the papers. The candidate is not responsible for any preparation other than furnishing the information which is requisite for completing the forms and forwarding the case, and should not be a signatory to the papers.

(2) In evaluating a candidate's research, the department should obtain a written evaluation from **no fewer than three, and no more than six members** of the profession or discipline who have not had a close association with the candidate. All letters received in response to a solicitation from the department must be included in the candidate's file, however, even if the total exceeds the recommended six.

(3) **A majority of the external referees should be nominated by a person other than the candidate and senior to him or her.** Each referee should be an acknowledged authority in his or her field and should hold at least the rank for which the candidate is being proposed.

(4) The solicitation of letters of evaluation should come from the department head or senior colleague charged with preparing the file, never from the candidate. It should be clear that the purpose of the letter is not to request an overall evaluation of the candidate's promotability, but, rather, to obtain a candid assessment of the candidate's research 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 include requests of a tendentious nature which indicate the desired outcome of the process. We recommend such phraseology as: "The Department of X is considering recommending candidate Y for promotion to the rank of..." DO NOT use such wording as: "We are hopeful that we can promote..." Cases in which such an attempt to influence judgment, pro or con, is evident, will run the risk of being turned back to the department (or reassigned within the appropriate college) for additional evaluations. Sample letters are available, upon request, from the Office of Academic Affairs.

(5) **Based on the Supreme Court decision in the University of Pennsylvania case, as well as recent court decisions involving discrimination claims by faculty who have been denied promotion and/or tenure, letters soliciting external reviews should state that the University shall maintain confidentiality, subject only to involuntary disclosure in legal proceedings.**

(6) All candidates should be allowed access to the prepared promotion papers with the exception of external letters of evaluation. External letters of evaluation may be made available to the candidate at the discretion of the department. Any unit is fully within its rights in declining to share the letters with a candidate. Those units which have offered the candidate access to such letters must observe the following conditions:

(a) the signature and all identifying characteristics (such as the name of the institution) should be removed from the copy seen by the candidate;

(b) the unit must offer this option consistently to its faculty or to a specific cohort group within the faculty;

(c) the evaluator must be advised of the candidate's limited access in the letter which solicits the evaluation.

(7) The tenure history should include year by year percent of contract along with the contract type (e.g., 100% A; 50% W; 100% 6Y; 20% NY; 100% Q; etc). If this information is not available in the department office, it can be obtained from the Office of Academic Personnel.

### **C. Department and College Level Reviewing Bodies**

(1) In colleges organized by departments, the vote will be that of eligible members of the department, as defined in II.A, above. The recommendation will be from the head or chair. In colleges not so organized, the vote will be that of the college executive committee (or promotion and tenure committee, where these are two distinct bodies), and the recommendation of the dean.

(2) Review at the college level will include:

(a) a vote of the college promotion and tenure committee and/or the executive committee, as defined in college bylaws and practice;

(b) the endorsement or non-endorsement of the college dean.

The written recommendation of the dean, as well as the vote of the college advisory committee(s) become a part of the candidate's promotion and tenure papers and are simultaneously forwarded to the Graduate College and Academic Affairs.

### **D. Review Beyond the College Level**

(1) Upon completion of the review of promotion and tenure cases by the department and the college, all cases other than those of academic clinical and clinical-track faculty will be submitted simultaneously to the Graduate College and the Office of Academic Affairs. Campus-level faculty review will be provided by the Executive Committee of the Graduate College, which will review each case and render its collective advice. The vote of the Executive Committee will be recorded and made part of the official file along with any explanatory comments the Committee wishes to provide. The Dean of the Graduate College will provide an independent recommendation to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs along with the record of the Committee vote.

(2) Cases of promotion in academic clinical or clinical rank should be referred directly to the Office of Academic Affairs by the Dean of the College from which the recommendation is coming. Academic clinical (tenure track) cases will be reviewed by a separate advisory panel to the Vice Chancellor. Clinical non-tenure track promotions are reviewed only in the Office of Academic Affairs. In case of doubt as to whether a particular faculty personnel action should be referred to the Graduate College Executive Committee for review, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will make a determination after appropriate consultation.

(3) All cases will be reviewed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in light of the entire record of assessment at other levels. The recommendations of the Vice Chancellor are then submitted to the Chancellor for final review at the campus level.

#### **E. Communication with the Candidate**

(1) Candidates for promotion and tenure are to be informed in writing of the outcome of their case at each level of review, and the endorsement or non-endorsement by their unit's executive officer.

(2) The votes of any review committees and the recommendations of the chair or head, dean, Graduate Dean, and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will be communicated to the candidate promptly and in writing at each stage of the review process. Such communication will be made by the head, who, along with any intermediate administrative officers, will be informed of the outcome in a prompt and timely fashion by the recommending officer or review body at each stage of the review. The candidate, at his or her request, is entitled to a brief oral or written statement of the reasons for any judgment rendered, but all such statements must preserve confidentiality with respect to the identity of the referees and the participants in any discussion, and any such statement should be framed with sufficient generality so as not to invite detailed rejoinder or debate, which is inappropriate at intermediate levels of review. We commend the practice now observed in at least one college, in which the unit executive officer reads the dean's confidential statement in the promotion and tenure papers in the dean's office and conveys the essence of it orally to the candidate.

(3) Upon receipt of a negative vote and recommendation from either the department or the line college, a candidate at tenure code "6" should be allowed one week (seven calendar days) to withdraw his or her papers and submit a written waiver of review and a resignation effective no later than August 31 of the following academic year, before the papers are forwarded to the next level for review. S/he will then be issued a terminal

contract for the specified year of resignation. For example, if a departmental vote in November, 1991 in a sixth year review is negative, the candidate may elect to resign effective no later than August 31, 1993.

(4) The option of withdrawal without resignation, for example in case of proposed early promotion and tenure of probationary faculty or of proposed promotion from the rank of tenured associate professor to that of full professor, is likewise available to candidates in those categories. Such withdrawal may take place without prejudice to a de novo review in some future review cycle.

(5) In either case, the candidate has one week (seven calendar days) to respond. If no response is received from the candidate, the papers should be forwarded to the next level for review.

#### **F. New Information, Reconsiderations, and Appeals of Negative Decisions**

(1) Because of the length of the review process, it is possible that the candidate's record may improve significantly or that other information pertinent to a case may come to light during the course of the review. If, in the judgment of the candidate, or the department head, new information could affect the outcome of the case, it should be submitted at any stage of the process. In the interest of time and consistency, the head of the originating department should formally transmit all such material directly to the level at which the case is currently under review, and to all intervening levels. The office currently reviewing the case should incorporate this material into the candidate's papers for submission to any further levels of review.

(2) Reconsideration may be appropriate upon the receipt of new information of a substantial nature relevant to the possible outcome of the case, and a request for such reconsideration may be filed by the unit head or dean. The need for the timely processing of a case, in addition to the fact that such new information normally becomes available at a more advanced point in the calendar, will usually dictate that either an appeal or reconsideration will take place after a case has reached the Office of Academic Affairs.

(3) The term "appeal" is applicable in cases in which the candidate is alleging a procedural irregularity or substantive new information justifies reconsideration, i.e., a major new publication or the award of a substantial research grant. Procedural appeals may be raised at any level, but appeals based on new information may only be made to the Chancellor at the end of the campus review process.

(4) The only remedy for any procedural irregularities that may be demonstrated by the candidate is the removal of the irregularity; that is, a favorable finding based on procedural irregularity alone does not alter a prior recommendation on the merits, and the appropriate next step is a re-review commencing at the level which led to the filing of a complaint. Every effort should be made to adjudicate any procedural appeals and carry out re-reviews, if warranted, within the overall timetable of the promotion and tenure process (so as to provide the papers and recommendations to the next review level on schedule). All subsequent review levels should be immediately notified by the executive officer if a delay is anticipated.

### III. Mid-Probation Reviews

#### A. Third Year Review Policy

(1) It is campus policy that a formal, internal review of faculty on probationary contracts will take place no later than the third year of the faculty member's full-time residence at UIC, unless a decision not to retain is reached at the level of the recommending unit before the time a formal review would be scheduled. All tenure-track faculty should be informed of this policy at the time of their initial appointment. Please note that depending on the tenure code agreed upon at the time of initial appointment, this policy is not necessarily applicable to all faculty with code "3" in 1991-92. Thus, if a faculty member's initial contract carried a tenure code higher than "1", the review may fall at a later point in the probationary period, albeit still before the sixth-year review. The intent is to provide both an assessment of the faculty member at a date which permits a reasonable review of his or her progress toward tenure since the initial appointment, and, when the outcome of the mid-probation review is positive, further 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 third-year 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 'Anticipated Personnel Actions/Mid-Probation Reviews' form.

(2) Each academic unit (normally the department) will devise procedures suitable to its own concerns for a thorough review with conclusions put in writing, with a copy to be placed in departmental files and one going to the affected faculty member. That individual should be given an opportunity to comment orally or in writing, and any written comments will be made part of the departmental personnel file. The use of outside evaluators at this stage is a matter of departmental discretion.

(3) Evaluation should cover the three areas specified in the Statutes: teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service. A favorable review may result in recommendation for continued employment, with additional reviews as deemed desirable in subsequent years. An unfavorable review may result in the issuance of a terminal contract for the following academic year. Since a full six-year probationary period is not guaranteed, non-retention may be recommended at any time during year #1 through year #5 with a terminal contract given for the following year (Statutes: Article X, Section 1b(6)). Notification to a candidate by the Board of Trustees prior to March 1 during the first year of the candidate's probationary period is sufficient to terminate his or her service at the end of the contract year with no obligation of an additional terminal year (Statutes: Article X, Section 1b(4)).

(4) Since UIC no longer permits candidates to be recommended for promotion on a "track" other than that in which they have been employed for the previous 3 years, the third year review may be the last appropriate opportunity to consider changing a candidate's track. Changing tracks at the third year review would allow enough time for the candidate to build up the 3 years necessary for him/her to be eligible for promotion at the end of the probationary period (see Appendix E).

#### **B. Non-Retention Prior to the Sixth Year**

(1) There are no special forms for notice of non-retention. A written notice of non-retention to candidates in the first through fifth years of their probationary period, and a filing of change-of-status forms is sufficient in such cases. Recommendations for termination in the sixth year of service must be acted on by the department, or unit, before March 1 of the fifth year. Within one week of notification of non-retention, any candidate may respond with a written resignation and be issued a terminal contract for the following year. (Please note that at tenure code "1", a terminated employee is not accorded an extra year if notified by the Board of Trustees by March 1.)

(2) The enclosed forms should be used in any sixth-year case; whether the departmental or other unit recommendation is positive or negative.

#### **IV. Exclusions**

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

B. Non-tenure track clinical promotions are reviewed only in the Office of Academic Affairs. A single copy of the promotion recommendation should be forwarded to Academic Affairs from the dean's office of the college recommending the personnel action.

Appendix A

TIMETABLE FOR ACTIONS RELATING TO PROMOTION AND TENURE 1991-92

- Monday, November 5 Deans and Directors notify Office of Academic Affairs of promotion and tenure cases under review in their units, including mid-probation reviews (for Academic and Academic Clinical).
- Monday, November 25 Deans and Directors notify the Office of Academic Affairs of any changes in departmental and/or college promotion and tenure procedures since the filing of the last reports in fall, 1990.
- Monday, January 24 Deans and Directors submit personnel action forms for all promotion and tenure recommendations other than those in the Academic Clinical and Clinical tracks.\* The original plus 17 copies of each recommendation should be submitted to the Graduate College; 4 copies should be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs (2732 UH).
- Monday, March 23 Deans and Directors submit personnel action forms for all faculty recommended for promotion in Academic Clinical and Clinical rank to the Office of Academic Affairs (2732 UH). The original plus 12 copies of each recommendation should be submitted.
- Monday, March 30 Graduate Dean submits recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (2732 UH).
- Monday, April 20 Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs submits recommendations to the Chancellor and notifies Deans, Directors, and Department Heads/Chairs of those recommendations.

TIMETABLE FOR ACTIONS RELATING TO NON-RETENTION

- Tuesday, January 21 Deans and Directors submit Change of Status forms for the non-retention of faculty members with tenure symbol "1".
- Friday, March 2 Deans and Directors submit Change of Status forms for the non-retention of faculty members with tenure symbol "5".
- Monday, June 29 Deans and Directors submit Change of Status forms for the non-retention of faculty members with tenure symbol "2" through "4".

---

\*Faculty members with tenure symbol "6" whose promotion and tenure is not supported at the departmental level may elect to resign before their papers are forwarded to the next level of review or at any time thereafter. A terminal contract will be issued. See "Academic Personnel Action Policies and Procedures, 1991-92", page 7, paragraph E3. If the option of resignation is not exercised within 7 calendar days, the full papers will be forwarded to the Graduate College and the Office of Academic Affairs for review.

ANTICIPATED PERSONNEL ACTIONS  
MID-PROBATION REVIEWS

College \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year \_\_\_\_\_

NAME	DEPARTMENT	PRESENT RANK	INITIAL APPT. DATE	PRESENT TENURE CODE
------	------------	--------------	--------------------	---------------------

ANTICIPATED PERSONNEL ACTIONS

PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS

College \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year \_\_\_\_\_

NAME	DEPARTMENT	PRESENT RANK	PROPOSED RANK	PRESENT TENURE CODE
------	------------	--------------	---------------	---------------------

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PREPARATION OF UIC PROMOTION AND TENURE PAPERS**

This document is a set of instructions to be used in gathering and reporting the data necessary to evaluate promotion and tenure recommendations beyond the department or unit level. It is NOT a set of criteria or procedures for P&T review. Some of the items requested on the P&T forms are self-explanatory, while others require definition or interpretation to avoid the submission of unnecessary information or the wrong information. **Please read these instructions carefully, with a blank set of P&T forms in hand.**

**General Instructions:**

1. All forms and attached documents must be typed. Handwritten materials (e.g., outside letters) may be submitted, but typed transcriptions must be included.
2. All information, apart from supporting documents, must be transcribed onto P&T forms. Resumes and CVs **SHOULD NOT** be submitted.
3. Where there is insufficient space on the forms to answer a particular question or provide extensive data, additional pages should be included. These should carry the same number as the page which contains the question, followed by suffixes a, b, c, etc., as needed. For example, T-2 would be followed by T-2a, T-2b, etc.
4. Unless otherwise specified, the data requested should be confined to the period since the nominee's last promotion, or, in the case of faculty hired as assistant professors and now being considered for promotion and tenure, the nominee's initial appointment.
5. All external evaluations of the nominee solicited for the purpose of the departmental or unit review must be forwarded with the P&T forms.
6. The forms should be duplicated in the department.

**Detailed Instructions:** (pages I-VI)

## pp. I-II. COVER SHEETS

Most items on the two cover sheets are self-explanatory. Question 3.b on the second cover sheet (Official distribution of time) need only be filled out if the nominee's activities do not follow the usual

distribution of effort between teaching, research, and service.

p. III. JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION

This statement must be written by the executive officer of the originating department or unit. This summary assessment should include a general evaluation of the nominee's activities in the areas of teaching ability, research and scholarship, service activities, and promise for the future as well as a general assessment of his/her role within the framework of the department's mission and the goals of the campus.

pp. IV-V JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION

These assessments should be written (IV) by the dean or director of the unit to which the originating unit reports and (V) by the Dean of the Graduate College.

p. VI. SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE REVIEW ACTIONS

The vote of each committee must be attested by its chair--in some cases, a unit executive officer; in others, a faculty member.

SECTION I. TEACHING ABILITY AND PERFORMANCE (pp. T-1-T-4)

A. Courses Taught

List courses taught by the candidate in each semester (term) for the past three years. Indicate the enrollment and level (Grd. for graduate, Ugrd. for undergraduate, Prof. for professional, Post. for postgraduate); also indicate whether elective, required, or optional. If other than primary instructor, provide course information above and identify by number below, specifying the nominee's role.

B. Graduate Students Supervised

Give the names and degree category of graduate students supervised since the last personnel action, their thesis titles, and the beginning and completion date for each work. Indicate whether the candidate was thesis director or was involved in other ways.

SECTION I. (Continued)C. Residents and Post-Doctoral Fellows Supervised

Give the names of residents and post-doctoral fellows supervised since the last personnel action, their assignments, and the beginning and completion date for each resident. Also provide a brief statement discussing the nature of the interaction between the nominee and those supervised, the time and effort involved, and the expertise brought by the nominee to the relationship.

D. Direction of Research Associates, Visiting Scholars, and Technicians

If the nominee has provided direction to research associates, visiting scholars, or technicians, describe the nature of the interaction(s) and the nominee's specific role(s).

E. Department (or Unit) Head's Appraisal of Nominee's Teaching Ability

The head or chair of the nominee's department is asked to give an overall assessment of the nominee's teaching ability in one of the following four categories:

Excellent	--	has a rare ability to motivate and instruct students; very highly regarded (in top 10% of teachers in department)
Good	--	communicates well, motivates students; is highly regarded
Average	--	performs adequately in teaching responsibilities
Below Average	--	exhibits some problems in communication, has been the subject of student complaints, or has other problems related to teaching responsibilities.

SECTION I. (Continued)

This ranking should be justified in a statement indicating whether a formal appraisal system is used in the department, its nature, and how the nominee ranks with respect to department, college, or University norms. **DO NOT INCLUDE RAW DATA.** The data provided should cover at least all courses taught in the past year. Where less is provided, justification for the omission should be given.

If classroom visitation is a basis for the appraisal of the nominee's teaching ability, letters from senior colleagues evaluating instructional effectiveness should be appended immediately following course evaluation data, if any.

If the nominee has clinical teaching responsibilities, letters from former residents/fellows or others supervised by the nominee may be appropriate to assist in appraising the nominee's clinical teaching. Append these following course evaluation data.

Letters from senior colleagues attesting to the nominee's performance in off-campus lectures or seminars while a member of the UIC faculty may also be used.

Include any other information indicating outstanding performance such as successful placement of students in employment or placement of undergraduates who have done extensive work with the candidate in graduate or professional schools or advanced training programs.

F. Contributions to Instructional Techniques and Teaching Materials

Describe any special instructional techniques and new teaching materials developed by the candidate. Indicate other unique contributions to instruction and/or clinical teaching.

G. Formal Recognition of Distinction in Teaching

Self-explanatory.

SECTION I. (Continued)H. Department (or Unit) Head's Appraisal of Nominee's Contributions to Curriculum Development

The head or chair of the nominee's department is asked to assess the nominee's contribution to curriculum development on the following scale:

Above Average	--	has developed major new course areas or innovative courses
Average	--	has met general curriculum development obligations
Below Average	--	has contributed little or nothing to curriculum development.

An average rating requires no justification. Above or below average ratings must be justified. Specify the basis of the appraisal (e.g., indicate the receipt of such awards as a UIC curriculum development award or an award from the Exxon Foundation).

SECTION II. RESEARCH ABILITY AND ACHIEVEMENT (pp. R-1 - R-5)

In this section, please assemble evidence on research, creative and other scholarly activities for the items below, where applicable.

A-D. Post Ph.D. (or Terminal Degree) Honors and Awards, etc.

Please provide dates and a brief explanation of the nature of the award.

E. Proposals and Sponsored Research Activities for Past Five Years

Include both external sources and University sources. If the nominee has been responsible for development of significant proposals given a status of "approved, not funded, indicate NF (in space requesting amount funded) and provide relevant information as specified on the form.

SECTION II. (Continued)F. Publications, Papers and Other Scientific, Creative, or Scholarly Works

The nominee's productivity should be documented in the following categories:

- (i) Publications or other creative work relevant to the discipline dated **BEFORE** last personnel action (initial appointment or most recent promotion, whichever is relevant)
  - (a) Books and monographs
  - (b) Articles in refereed journals
  - (c) Other articles, including bulletins and technical reports
  - (d) Chapters in books
  - (e) Book reviews
  - (f) Creative works, e.g., poetry, composition, exhibitions
  - (g) Other, e.g., notes and comments
- (ii) Publications or other creative work relevant to the discipline dated **SINCE** last personnel action, with same subdivisions as under (i)
- (iii) Work completed and in press, with same subdivisions as under (i)
- (iv) Work in progress
- (v) Papers presented at professional meetings--if relevant, distinguish between volunteered and invited papers
- (vi) Other scientific contributions, creative or scholarly works which are notable in terms of originality and importance (specify, e.g., case reports, literature reviews appropriate to clinical work, etc.).

Place a heading for the appropriate category of each listing. Refereed journals should be indicated by an asterisk in the left margin, and other types of publications or communications should be identified (e.g., monograph or bulletin, article, review or abstract). In case of joint authorship, indicate senior author, if any, by underlining. Give complete bibliographical references inclusive of pagination. If any publication has been reprinted, please provide full bibliographical reference for the reprint **immediately following** the citation of the place of first publication.

SECTION II. (Continued)

If works were juried or subjected to outside evaluation, indicate what award, competitive ranking, critical acclaim, or other form of recognition were accorded.

G. Nominee's Statement on Current and Planned Research, Creative, or Scholarly Work

On the page provided, the nominee should give a statement pertinent to his/her research, creative, and scholarly efforts. The statement should discuss current efforts, the progression of investigative or other efforts over past years and expectations for the future. Please use attached page R-4 for this purpose.

H. Letters from External Referees

The Department (or Unit) Head should obtain a written evaluation from no fewer than three members of the profession from academic or research settings outside the campus who have not had a close association with the candidate and no more than six external professional evaluations overall. A majority of the letters should be from referees not nominated by the candidate. Referees should usually be at an academic rank senior to the present rank of the candidate. **DO NOT** request evaluations from former professors or fellow students unless such persons can comment on the candidate's work since leaving the graduating institution. In any case, no more than one letter may be from such a person. The most helpful letters are those which discuss the nominee's scholarly and creative activities in detail.

All responses to evaluation requests must be included, favorable or not. Please attach a sample copy of the letter used to solicit the reviews of outside evaluators appended to the first referee letter. Your attention is called to II.A(4) of the accompanying guidelines, "Academic Personnel Action Policies and Procedures, 1990-91," regarding the framing of the letter of solicitation. A brief biographical sketch of each referee should immediately precede the letter of reference with which it is associated. **DO NOT** use biographical data reproduced directly from a reference source. Use page R-5 in the attached forms, modified with appropriate pagination and duplicated as needed for each referee. At the bottom of the form, the individual nominating the referee should be identified, as well as the referee's relationship to the nominee. The sequence of this section should run: R-5-0--letter for soliciting evaluations; R-5a--first referee's biography; R-5a-1--first referee's response; R-5b--second referee's biography, and so forth.

SECTION III. SERVICE (pp. S-1 - S-3)

Definition: Ability and performance in committee work, student services, patient care, continuing education, public service and special assignments.

A. Administrative Responsibilities

List the nominee's administrative responsibilities, with specific duties indicated, in the period since the last promotion.

B. Special Contributions to Development of the Academic Unit's Program

List the nominee's special contributions to the development of the academic unit and its programs, e.g., major committee assignments and projects undertaken on behalf of the unit.

C. Service Within the University Since Last Promotion

Indicate committee assignments since the promotion or other personnel action, with inclusive dates, most recent first. College and University committees should be listed separately.

If the assignment was elective, indicate this by means of an asterisk in the left margin. When applicable, attach written statements from committee chairpersons outside the department assessing the nature and effectiveness of the nominee's committee work.

Where committee assignments have been minimal, an explanation (e.g., departmental policy) should be given.

D. Patient Care Services

Describe the nominee's contributions to University-related patient care services. Support letters from internal reviewers and colleagues who can evaluate the nominee's contribution to patient care and the health care team may be appended to this section.

E. Student and Related Services

Indicate the type and numbers of students, residents/fellows advised by the nominee as well as any special counseling services, clinical or health services; work with student groups or organizations; or other student services.

SECTION III. (Continued)F. Non-University Professional Activities

Describe non-University professional activities, such as offices held in professional organizations, editorship, and other activities providing the nominee with national or international recognition. Give inclusive data, most recent first. **DO NOT** include merely membership in societies unless membership is limited to highly qualified individuals and is indicative of significant services contributions.

G. Public Service Activities

Describe external activities based on professional expertise and related to UIC's public service objectives. These should be listed with inclusive dates, the most recent first, in the categories enumerated.

H. Department (or Unit) Head's Appraisal of Nominee's Service Record

The head of chair of the nominee's department is asked to give an overall assessment of the nominee's service records in one of the following three categories:

- |               |    |  |
|---------------|----|--|
| Excellent     | -- | Shows outstanding leadership and creativity in service-oriented activities. Provides highly regarded service to department, college, campus, and University committees, professional organizations, community groups, and/or patients and clients. |
| Satisfactory  | -- | Participates willingly in service related activities and demonstrates appropriate growth in responsibility over time.<br>(Expected level of performance for untenured faculty).  |
| Below Average | -- | Is reluctant to participate voluntarily or to accept assignments in service activities pertinent to the field of expertise and the responsibilities of University citizenship.   |

This ranking should be justified in a statement from the department head indicating how the nominee ranks with respect to department, college, or University norms.

SECTION III. (Continued)

Letters from senior UIC colleagues and appropriate external referees evaluating the nominee's service records and participation and any other relevant evidence should be appended immediately following the department head's evaluation to support an "Excellent" rating. Documentation is optional in other cases.

Exhibit D

COVER SHEET

P&T Form I

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO

College \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_

FACULTY EVALUATION FOR PERSONNEL ACTION  
(CONFIDENTIAL)

Nominee \_\_\_\_\_  
(Last Name) (First) (Middle)

Graduate College Status: \_\_\_ Member \_\_\_ Assoc. Member \_\_\_ Non-Member

Personnel Action Being Considered:

\_\_\_ Promotion to rank of Professor

\_\_\_ Promotion to rank of Associate Professor

\_\_\_ Promotion (with tenure) to the rank of \_\_\_\_\_  
(specify rank)

\_\_\_ Tenure in present rank \_\_\_\_\_  
(specify current rank)

Papers prepared by \_\_\_\_\_  
(print name) (signature)

Endorsement Non-endorsement (complete for applicable review levels)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Department Head or Chair)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(College Dean or Unit Director)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Dean of Graduate College)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Chair of Clinical Committee)

Final Disposition in Office of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs)



P&T Form

III

Date \_\_\_\_\_

College \_\_\_\_\_

Nominee \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_

JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department Head or Chair

P&T Form

IV

Date \_\_\_\_\_ College \_\_\_\_\_

Nominee \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_

JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION

\_\_\_\_\_ I agree with the recommendation of the Department Head/Chair for the reasons detailed below:

\_\_\_\_\_ I disagree with the recommendation of the Department Head/Chair for and an explanation is detailed below:

\_\_\_\_\_  
College Dean/Unit Director

P&T Form

V

Date \_\_\_\_\_ College \_\_\_\_\_

Nominee \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_

JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION

\_\_\_\_\_ I agree with the recommendation of the Department Head/Chair for the reasons detailed below:

\_\_\_\_\_ I disagree with the recommendation of the Department Head/Chair for and an explanation is detailed below:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

Nominee \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_ College \_\_\_\_\_

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE REVIEW ACTIONS

	Number eligible to vote	Yes	No	Abstentions	Absences
Department Review Committee	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Date _____					
Chair _____					
College/Unit PT committee (if separate)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Date _____					
Chair _____					
College/Unit Executive Committee	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Date _____					
Chair _____ (normally Dean)					
Graduate College	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Date _____					
Chair _____ (normally Graduate Dean)					
Clinical Committee (where applicable)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Date _____					
Chair _____					

## I. TEACHING ABILITY AND PERFORMANCE

A. List courses taught by the candidate in each quarter for the past three years.

Course Number	Quarter and Title	Qtr. Hrs.	Specify Level	Enrollment	Check one		
					Elect.	Requir.	Opt.Req.*

\*Optional required indicates one of a set of possible choices among required courses.

B. Graduate Students Supervised

C. Residents and Post-Doctoral Fellows Supervised

D. Direction of Research Associate, Visiting Scholars, and Technicians

E. Department Head's appraisal of the nominee's teaching ability.  
See cover instructions.

Excellent     Good     Average     Below Average

Justify the above assessment and attach any supporting documents.

## F. Contributions to Instructional Techniques and Teaching Materials

G. Has the nominee's teaching ability received formal recognition?

No

Yes (if yes, please indicate the nature of this recognition, including the dates of awards)

H. Department Head's appraisal of the nominee's contribution to curriculum development

Above average     Average     Below average

Justify an above or below average rating.

II. RESEARCH ABILITY AND ACHIEVEMENT

A. Post Ph.D. (or terminal degree) Honors and Awards

B. Invited Colloquia

C. Professional Licensing

D. Other Evidence of Recognition



F. Publications, Papers, and Other Scientific, Creative, or Scholarly Works

List the following categories consecutively

- ( i) Publications or other creative work relevant to the discipline,  
dated before last personnel action
- ( ii) Publications or other creative work relevant to the discipline,  
dated since last personnel action
- (iii) Work completed and in press or otherwise forthcoming
- ( iv) Work in progress
- ( v) Papers presented at professional meetings
- ( vi) Other scientific, creative or scholarly works

Please consult instructions for the proper subdivisions for categories (i), (ii), and (iii).

G. Nominee's Statement on Current and Planned Research, Creative or  
Scholarly Work

Brief Biographical Sketch of Referee: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Type referee's name here)

The above referee was proposed by:

- the nominee
- from a list of \_\_\_\_ (indicate number) names submitted by the nominee
- someone other than the nominee -- \_\_\_\_\_  
(specify)

Referee's relationship to the nominee:

- none
  - as specified (e.g., former professor; co-author; colleague; dissertation director; fellow student, etc.)
- 
-

Please complete the page numbers appropriately (see directions)!

S(Service)-I

### III. SERVICE

A. Administrative responsibilities since last promotion or personnel action with duties indicated below:

( ) check here if none

B. Special contribution to the development of the academic unit's program.

C. Service within the University since last promotion

D. Patient care service

( ) check here if none

E. Student and related services

F. Non-university professional activities

G. Public service activities, including

- ( i) Workshops and general continuing education programs
- ( ii) Staff development of personnel of external agencies
- ( iii) Advancement of the discipline (other than those in F)
- ( iv) Community advisory committees and services

H. Department Head's appraisal of the nominee's service record.  
See cover instructions.

Excellent                       Satisfactory                       Below Average

Justify the above assessment and attach any supporting documents.


# UIC

The University of Illinois at Chicago

Office of the Chancellor (M/C 102)  
2833 University Hall  
Box 4348, Chicago, Illinois 60680  
(312) 413-3350

July 9, 1991

TO: Robert W. Resek  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: James J. Stukel   
Chancellor

RE: Modifications to Promotion and Tenure Process in Chicago

Based on recent discussions with your office, I am mandating the following changes in promotion and tenure procedures at UIC:

1. A data sheet, verified by the Office of Academic Personnel, listing the detailed employment history of the candidate at UIC will be added to the promotion and tenure file of each candidate.
2. The campus will no longer permit candidates to be recommended for promotion on a "track" other than that in which they have been employed for the previous 3 years. For example, Clinical Assistant Professors may be promoted to Clinical Associate Professors, Assistant Professors of Clinical Medicine may be promoted to Associate Professors of Clinical Medicine, and Assistant Professors may be promoted to Associate Professors, but Clinical Assistant Professors may not be promoted to Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors may not be promoted to Clinical Associate Professors.

JJS/ss  
cc: David Broski  
Ronald Legon  
Deans' Council