

PROMOTION AND TENURE

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST COMMUNICATION NO. 9

I. OVERVIEW	1
A. Calendar of Events*	2
B. Assistance	2
II. CRITERIA AND GENERAL GUIDELINES	3
A. Criteria	3
1. Process Overview	6
2. Preparing the Promotion Documents.....	6
B. Evaluation of the Candidate’s Performance and Potential.....	6
1. Candidate’s and Department Head’s Roles	6
2. Role and Composition of Promotion and Tenure Committees.....	7
3. In Cases of Split Votes or Negative Evaluations: Role of the Dean	8
4. Confidentiality	8
5. Evaluation of Teaching, Advising, and Student Mentoring.....	10
6. Evaluation of Service.....	11
7. Internal Evaluation of Research	11
8. Evaluation of Future Potential.....	12
9. Outside Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, Service, Public Engagement, and Creative Activity.....	13
a) Number of Letters from Outside Evaluators.....	13
b) Department and Candidate Participation in Selection of Evaluators.....	13
c) Criteria for Selection of Evaluators	14
d) Objectivity of Evaluators	14
e) Procedure for Soliciting Letters	15
f) Required Elements of a Letter Soliciting an Evaluation.....	15
g) Procedure for Providing Information on Evaluators.....	17
C. Other Notes.....	18
1. “Early” Promotion of an Assistant Professor	18
2. Revisions of Documents	18
D. Assistance.....	18
III. INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING PROMOTION PAPERS	19
A. General Instructions	19
B. Cover Sheet.....	20
C. Instructions for the Outline	20

1. Personal History and Professional Experience 20

2. Publications and Creative Works 21

3. Resident Instruction 23

 A. Summary of Instruction 23

 B. Evaluation of Instruction..... 24

4. Service (Public Engagement, Professional/Disciplinary, and University) 26

 A. Summary of Service..... 27

 B. Evaluation of Service 27

 Alternative #4 – Service for Faculty Members who have Public Engagement as a Primary
 Criterion for Promotion..... 28

 A. Summary of Service..... 28

 B. Evaluation of Disciplinary/Professional and University/Campus Service 29

5. Research..... 30

 A. Candidate’s Statement of Research Goals and Accomplishments 30

 B. Departmental Evaluation of Research Accomplishments..... 30

 C. Departmental Evaluation of Future Potential 31

6. External Evaluations..... 31

 A. Sample Letter(s) to External Evaluators 31

 B. Qualifications of the External Evaluators 32

 C. External Letters 32

7. Comments by the Unit Executive Officer 33

8. Special Comments by the Dean (only when needed) 33

IV. ASSISTANCE..... 34

V. ATTACHMENTS..... 34

 1. Checklist for Transmittal of Recommendation 34

 2. Recommendation for Promotion and Tenure (Cover Sheet and Outline) 34

 3. A Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review
 Process 34

 4. Senate Promotion and Tenure Information Questionnaire 34

 5. Sample Letter to External Evaluator 34

PROMOTION AND TENURE

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST COMMUNICATION NO. 9

I. OVERVIEW

Decisions to promote faculty members and to award tenure are the most important made by the University, for they determine the quality of the faculty for decades to come. *Because tenure has consequences of long life and great magnitude, it should be awarded only when the best interest of the University of Illinois is clearly served by doing so. This is the overriding criterion.* Departments and colleges, therefore, are expected to adhere to the highest standards in their recommendations, particularly for appointments to indefinite tenure. The expectations of excellence implicit in the procedures laid out in this document apply to all candidates proposed for appointments with tenure at the University of Illinois.

The University uses a multi-stage process for promotion and tenure decisions. Each year, academic units determine which faculty members should be considered for promotion and/or tenure. Entry-level faculty members are normally assigned a tenure code of “1” upon initial employment, which is incremented in each successive year. Faculty members with a tenure code of “6” must be reviewed for promotion and tenure. Those in the penultimate year of a “Q” appointment must be reviewed for indefinite tenure. Faculty members with indefinite tenure are reviewed for promotion at the discretion of the unit or according to policies determined by individual colleges.

Instructions for Preparing Promotion Papers provides details on preparing the dossier. The Cover Sheet and Outline can be found in the attachments to this Communication. A promotion dossier, including letters and the cover sheet with votes, is required for all faculty members in year 6 of the probationary period.

The process takes most of the academic year because each recommendation for promotion or tenure is reviewed at multiple levels, including the home unit and at each successive unit in the reporting chain up through the campus level. *Every case is reviewed by at least two levels.* The faculty of the unit, through procedures defined in the unit’s by-laws, develop a recommendation. For the recommendation to advance, the executive officer must endorse the recommendation and submit documentation supporting and explaining the recommendation. Promotion and tenure committees above the level of an individual’s unit judge how well the case has been made either for the granting of indefinite tenure or for promotion. In general, they do not evaluate the specific work itself; this is done by the external referees and by the faculty of the unit(s) in which his or her appointment lies. It is the overall quality of the candidate’s record and the accompanying documentation, rather than the length of the dossier or the claims made for the significance of any single piece of work, that determines the final outcome.

The Provost makes the final decision, with advice from the Campus Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

In the event of a negative decision for faculty members in the sixth year of their probationary period or those in the penultimate year of a “Q” appointment, see Communication No. 10, *Guidelines and Procedures for Notice of Non-Reappointment for Non-Tenured Faculty Members and For Denials of Tenure and/or Promotion of Faculty*. The University’s *Statutes* also provide that faculty members may present grievances to the Faculty Advisory Committee.

A. Calendar of Events*

December 15	Recommendations for promotions due in the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
February 1	Recommendations for promotions sent to the Campus Committee on Promotion and Tenure.
April 30	Campus Committee on Promotion and Tenure submits preliminary recommendations to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
May 15	Final letter to deans and directors notifying them of those faculty members to be recommended to the Chancellor and President for promotion.

*If any of the indicated dates falls on a weekend, the first business day following that date will serve as the deadline. Adherence to these dates is critical for full deliberation and consideration of a case.

Please note: Deadlines for submission of promotion papers to college offices will pre-date these deadlines, and may differ by college. Please check these dates with the relevant college office.

B. Assistance

For questions about promotion and tenure criteria, policies, or procedures, please call the Office of the Provost (333-6677).

II. CRITERIA AND GENERAL GUIDELINES

The description of the criteria and general considerations in recommending promotion and tenure are presented in the following sections:

- A. Criteria
 - 1. Process Overview
 - 2. Preparing the Promotion Documents

- B. Evaluation of the Candidate's Performance and Potential
 - 1. Candidate's and Department Head's Roles
 - 2. Role and Composition of Promotion and Tenure Committees
 - 3. In Cases of Split Votes or Negative Evaluations: Role of the Dean or Director
 - 4. Confidentiality
 - 5. Evaluation of Teaching, Advising and Student Mentoring
 - 6. Evaluation of Service
 - 7. Internal Evaluation of Research
 - 8. Evaluation of Future Potential
 - 9. Outside Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, Teaching, Service, Public Engagement and Creative Activity

- C. Other Notes
 - 1. "Early" Promotion of an Assistant Professor
 - 2. Revisions of Documents

- D. Assistance

A. Criteria

Decisions to promote faculty members and to award tenure are the most important made by the University, for they determine the quality of the faculty for decades to come. *Because tenure has consequences of long life and great magnitude, it should be awarded only when the best interest of the University of Illinois is clearly served by doing so. This is the overriding criterion.* Departments and colleges, therefore, are expected to adhere to the highest standards in their recommendations, particularly for appointments to indefinite tenure.

Several questions should be asked in any case where tenure is at issue. The first question is whether the candidate would improve the overall quality of the unit's tenured staff. The second question is whether the unit is better able to improve itself by granting promotion and tenure or by hiring anew. The third question is whether the candidate is likely to maintain or improve his or her quality and his or her contributions to the unit over the long period typically involved in a tenured appointment. The department, the college, and the university should not accept a lifetime obligation if there is serious doubt on any of these points.

Promotion to associate professor on indefinite tenure should be recommended only if an individual shows concrete evidence of accomplishments. Additionally, it should be clear that the individual shows real promise of becoming a leading scholar and teacher, creative artist, or provider of public service, according to the primary assigned responsibilities. That promise should be supported by tangible evidence. Put another way, a recommendation for tenure should be based upon an assessment that the candidate has made contributions of an appropriate magnitude and quality in research, teaching, and service, and has demonstrated a high likelihood of sustaining contributions to the field and to the department, so that granting indefinite tenure is in the best interest of the University of Illinois. The recommendation package should include comments by the unit executive officer indicating succinctly why the department will be strengthened by such a commitment and why the best interests of the university will be served.

Promotion from associate professor to professor should include evidence of national or international stature in a field, supervision of graduate or professional students to degree completion (or corresponding achievements involving undergraduates for positions permitting minimal engagement in graduate/professional education), and that he or she is a leading scholar and teacher, creative artist, or provider of public service, according to the primary assigned responsibilities. A recommendation for promotion of an associate professor should be based upon an assessment that, since the last promotion, the candidate has made contributions of appropriate magnitude, independence and quality in research, teaching, and service, and has demonstrated the ability to sustain contributions to the field and to the department, so that granting the promotion is in the best interest of the University of Illinois. The recommendation package should include the comments by the unit executive officer indicating succinctly why the department will be strengthened by such a commitment and why the best interests of the university will be served.

The three primary missions of the University are teaching, research, and service and public engagement. In any promotion review, consideration should be given to the performance of the individual in all three of these areas. However, the three need not be treated equally. Their interpretation and weight should reflect the definition of the position to which the individual has been appointed and to which he or she might be promoted.

The word “research” is interpreted throughout this document to include not only research and scholarship as narrowly understood, but to encompass creative artistry and research that is inter-disciplinary and/or translational. The terms “research,” “scholarship,” “scholarly achievement,” and “creative work” are used interchangeably here to denote this broader range of activity.

In general, the focus of all sections relating to research (bibliographic, descriptive, or evaluative) is on progress since the last important career step; viz., initial appointment as an assistant professor or promotion to associate professor, depending on the case. However, complete bibliographical information **must** always be provided covering the candidate’s entire career.

For most faculty members, the primary basis for promotion and tenure will be evidence of the high quality of both teaching and research, with consideration also being given to evidence of valuable public engagement or service to the University and professional communities. This University is committed to excellence in all of these areas, but we recognize that equal excellence in each of them in individual cases is rare. Promotion and tenure will generally be awarded only if the evidence shows that a candidate's research accomplishments are excellent and the candidate's teaching and/or public engagement record is also strong, or if a candidate's teaching or public engagement accomplishments are excellent and the candidate's research accomplishments are also sufficiently strong to meet the requirements for promotion. It will be unusual and exceptional to award promotion and tenure merely on the basis of strong performance in only one of these areas. In every instance, the record of teaching, public engagement and scholarship should be thoroughly documented, with due deference to the college and the campus definition of what constitutes high quality in each category. Several methods of evaluation should be used, and the record should be thorough enough to indicate not just past performance, but a high likelihood of continued excellence.

There are certain faculty roles for which the weighting of criteria for measuring excellence in research, teaching, and service may be appropriately different, such as in some forms of outreach and public engagement. In such cases, explicit criteria for judging the quality of performance must be developed by the candidate's department head or chair at the time of appointment, and there should be ample evidence that these criteria are being met in an exemplary fashion. When teaching is a primary part of public engagement such as in continuing and executive education, the activity should be judged according to criteria adapted from the evaluation of resident instruction. When research is a primary part of public engagement as in community development, translation of research findings to technology commercialization, school reform, and/or "action-research," the activity should be judged according to criteria adapted from the evaluation of research and scholarship discussed above, recognizing that such research may be more applied and field-based.

Faculty members who are in positions that are primarily public engagement-oriented should be evaluated with heavy weight on the quality of performance in their activities. Activities should share the following three distinguishing characteristics:

- They contribute to the public welfare or the common good.
- They call upon the faculty member's academic or professional expertise.
- They directly address or respond to societal problems, issues, interests or concerns.

In summary, scholarship, resident instruction, and service and public engagement are all to be considered at the time of promotion. The appropriate evidence of excellence and the procedures for making judgments will vary among fields of study and with the mix of research, resident instruction, and public engagement. Realistically, we cannot expect every faculty member to perform outstandingly in all of these areas. We, therefore, operate on a compensatory system such that, within a demand for overall strength, the required level of quality may be achieved with somewhat greater strength in one area than in another. But if a candidate is actually weak either in teaching or in scholarly achievements as defined by the

nature of the appointment, awarding a promotion or indefinite tenure may not be in the best interest of the University of Illinois.

1. Process Overview

To achieve tenure on this campus, it is necessary to receive positive recommendations at each level considering the case, beginning with the home unit. Each decision typically involves a two-step process encompassing review by a duly-constituted faculty committee as well as the independent endorsement of the executive officer. A case endorsed at the unit level requires successive levels of review, each of which must also act positively. The final recommendation on promotion and tenure is made by the Provost, acting with the advice and consultation of the Campus Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Promotion and tenure are granted upon action of the Board of Trustees.

Communication No. 10 provides information on the process that applies to negative recommendations. In brief, a candidate receiving a negative recommendation at any level may request a substantive reconsideration at that level and may request that the next-higher level executive officer review the procedures used to arrive at the recommendation. Thus, while a case receiving a positive recommendation is forwarded to the next level for further consideration, a case receiving a negative recommendation will be reviewed at the next level only for conformity with procedural notice requirements

2. Preparing the Promotion Documents

Detailed guidance on the development of promotion papers is available in Section III, *Instructions for Preparing Promotion Papers*, of this document. A recommendation must follow the standard format defined in the *Outline of Promotion Dossier*. The *Outline* calls for facts and descriptive text information concerning teaching, research, and public engagement and requires an evaluation of the work in each area.

B. Evaluation of the Candidate's Performance and Potential

1. Candidate's and Department Head's Roles

The department head/chair, or his or her designee, or the relevant committee as determined by the unit's bylaws, is responsible for preparing the promotion documents, including departmental evaluative materials. A candidate for promotion should never prepare departmental evaluative materials in support of his or her promotion recommendation.

The department head/chair or the relevant committee chair may designate one or more faculty members to evaluate each of the different aspects of the candidate's record. The evaluator should be a senior tenured faculty member, must hold equal or higher rank than the rank proposed for the candidate (i.e., only full professors should evaluate candidates for full professor), and should have no conflict of interest in evaluating the candidate (i.e., should not be a close collaborator, partner, etc.). It is not advisable that a single evaluator prepares more

than one section of the dossier (i.e., teaching evaluation, service evaluation, research evaluation, future potential). The department must provide the identity of the evaluator for each section.

The candidate may prepare descriptive material for the dossier and it must be reviewed and checked carefully by the department head/chair. Normally, it is best to have the candidate submit descriptive material and the department head or designee prepare the evaluative information in the required format.

In recommending the case to the next level, the EO will have the opportunity to make comments. The unit executive officer should indicate succinctly why the department will be strengthened and how the best interests of the University will be served by the promotion of the candidate, especially if the promotion includes indefinite tenure. The EO should discuss the following topics, including (but not limited to):

- any aspect of the candidate's record that has not been addressed in the dossier;
- any aspects of the candidate's research, teaching, or service record that may raise questions about the candidate's ability to sustain a high level of productivity;
- recusals in the evaluation process;
- split votes in the unit;
- the frequency of and reasons for declines by potential external evaluators;
- conflicts of interest in the external letters (e.g., if the external evaluator collaborated with the candidate or served in an advisory capacity);
- negative comments or recommendations by any external evaluator;
- if an "early" promotion to Associate, the reasons for that action;
- if promotion to Full Professor, justification for the timing of the recommendation.

In recommending the case to the next level, it is incumbent on the EO to explain why the case should go forward and is in the best interest of the University.

2. Role and Composition of Promotion and Tenure Committees

At each level in the process for considering promotion and tenure, a faculty committee provides advice to the Executive Officer concerning the merits of each candidate. The advice includes a formal vote of the committee with the results of the ballot recorded on the Promotion and Tenure Cover Sheet before it moves to the next level.

The specific procedures for selecting the members of department and college promotion and tenure committees are set in department and college bylaws. For faculty members who have budgeted joint appointments or are engaged in interdisciplinary scholarship, the guidelines in Provost's Communication No. 23 should be followed.

The procedures should respect four general principles:

- The first principle is that membership on promotion and tenure committees is limited to tenured members of the faculty.

- The second is that advice concerning candidates for the rank of full professor should be provided by only full professors, while both associate and full professors may participate in the advisory process for candidates for the rank of associate professor.
- The third principle is that the promotion and tenure evaluations should be independent across levels. That is, no individual should actively participate (e.g., review, evaluate, advocate, vote) in promotion and tenure reviews at two different levels. For example, an individual cannot advocate for a candidate or write an internal letter at the department or college level and also vote at the campus level. It is strongly encouraged that eligible faculty vote at the lowest level possible and subsequently recuse themselves from voting at higher levels.
- The fourth principle is that any individual with a conflict of interest, or the appearance of a conflict of interest, should not participate (e.g., review, evaluate, advocate, vote) in a candidate's promotion and tenure review. In general, a conflict of interest exists if an individual shared a common grant or was a close collaborator on a number of common projects with the candidate. The guiding principle is that an individual should recuse herself/himself from involvement in a case when that individual stands to benefit personally from the outcome of the case.

Exceptions in practice to these principles require the prior approval of the Provost.

Once the departmental evaluation of the candidate's qualifications is complete, eligible faculty members on the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee will have the opportunity to vote in favor of or against recommending promotion. Abstention should not appear as an option on the ballot.

The number of votes for and against recommending promotion as well as the number of faculty members who have been recused from the process will be reported on the dossier. The EO statement must include the reasons for each recusal. These reasons may include a conflict of interest, participation in the evaluation process at another level, or the inability to review the dossier due to the faculty member being on leave or sabbatical.

3. In Cases of Split Votes or Negative Evaluations: Role of the Dean

When a case is forwarded for campus review after significant questions were raised during its review at the college or school level, or by external evaluators, or it received a split vote, it is imperative that the Dean or Director of the submitting unit provide commentary on the case for successive reviewers. This commentary should explain the merits of the case and address forthrightly its strengths and weaknesses (see Section VIII of the dossier). To formulate this commentary, the dean or director may need to be present during the campus committee's discussion of the merits of the case.

4. Confidentiality

The Illinois Personnel Record Review Act allows faculty to inspect internal evaluation documentation used for promotion and tenure review; external and internal letters of reference are not subject to inspection by the candidate and should not be released to the candidate or to any other person without a legitimate role in the formal review process for the particular promotion and tenure case at issue. (Please note the distinction between internal evaluative material and letters of reference. Written comments by any individual who participates in the decision whether to grant tenure, such as the unit head or a member of a committee voting on the recommendation, generally fall into the category of internal evaluative materials and are thus subject to release.)

A copy of the P&T dossier shall be made available to the candidate upon the candidate's written request to his/her Unit Executive Officer. The earliest such request may be made is on the business day immediately following the P&T vote taken by the candidate's unit committee. When such a request is received, the Unit Executive Officer should provide all dossier materials to Academic Human Resources (AHR). Note that the dossier may be in draft or incomplete form (i.e., might not contain an EO statement) if a negative decision is made at the departmental level. AHR shall review and provide the dossier copy within the time period allowed by the Illinois Personnel Record Review Act (7 business days from receipt of said request, with a possibility of an additional 7 days when needed). The P&T dossier given to the candidate should be the dossier completed to date (including cover sheet with recorded votes but without information of the identity of the voters). Based on advice from University Legal Counsel, the following items should be removed or redacted:

- Qualifications of External Evaluators (Category VI, section B);
- External Review Letters (Category VI, section C);
- Internal Letters of Reference (solicited according to the guidelines in the following paragraph):

In the context of a promotion and tenure review, a department head/chair may solicit a letter of reference concerning the teaching or research abilities of the candidate from a colleague within the University of Illinois who is not in a supervisory position over the candidate (that is from a colleague other than people such as a division head, department head or dean). It is the University's view that such a document be excluded from disclosure as a "letter of reference." It is important to solicit such a "letter of reference" specifically and to make sure the person being asked to provide the letter is outside of the candidate's normal reporting chain. Other evaluations performed by a department head are disclosable to the faculty member. Guidelines on employee access to personnel records are contained in the Campus Administrative Manual, Section IX/A-16.

- Any direct quotes or attributions to either external or internal review letters contained in the dossier or in the Special Comments by the Unit Executive Officer.

5. Evaluation of Teaching, Advising, and Student Mentoring

The portion of the dossier focusing on teaching, advising, and student mentoring includes the candidate's statement of teaching goals and accomplishments, a summary of teaching performance, and the unit evaluation of teaching accomplishments.

Candidate Statement

The candidate must provide (in three pages or less) a personal statement of teaching philosophy, methods, strengths, goals, and other material in a manner that will present colleagues with a context for interpreting other evaluative information. Units are encouraged to ask the candidate to prepare this statement early in the process of review, so that it can be made available to persons who are asked to take a particular role in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching (e.g., as peer observers).

Unit Evaluation

All promotion and tenure recommendations must include a thorough evaluation of the candidate's teaching. While departments may use different methods to evaluate teaching quality, strong performance in teaching cannot be simply presumed; it must be demonstrated as convincingly as measures allow. The specific evaluative practices recommended, and in some cases required, appear in the attached *Instructions for Preparing Promotion Papers*. Faculty members who teach credit-bearing continuing education courses or professional development courses should use these same evaluative practices.

The teaching evaluation **must** include a summary of ICES data (or, in the alternative, a summary developed through use of a departmental instrument). (Please note the requirements in the *Instructions for Preparing Promotion Papers* if the standard report form from the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning is not used.) Units are encouraged to augment these required elements with results from additional methods of evaluation. Each unit shall have a clearly understood procedure for such additional evaluation. The following have proven effective when developed with care:

Peer observation. Visits to the candidate's classroom can be valuable. They should be made by at least two faculty observers for each of several courses. Visits should be made on more than one occasion in each course. Ideally, the unit will engage in peer observation throughout the probationary period.

Evidence of student learning. Provision of measures of student learning is encouraged. They might include measures included in the unit's outcomes assessment program that can be linked clearly to the work of the candidate, exceptional awards or recognition earned by the candidate's students, evidence of student success in later coursework, evaluation of student work products such as exams, papers, artwork, performances, and so on.

Information from students not currently enrolled, alumni, and others. Surveys or interviews with former students, alumni, and others can provide a different perspective from that of students currently enrolled. However, anecdotal comments from one or two people are generally not perceived as useful by review committees, because there is no basis for gauging the quality or representativeness of the comments. If information in this category is to be developed, it should be based on a method that can give a legitimate sample of views.

Generally, it has not proven useful to provide selected students comments from ICES forms, for essentially the same reason that anecdotal comments from other sources are of limited value. Review committees have no ability to judge either the relative frequency of favorable comments or the degree to which they might be offset by unfavorable commentary.

6. Evaluation of Service

A description and evaluation of the faculty member's service is required. Service encompasses public engagement activities, professional/disciplinary service and university service.

The Senate Committee on Public Engagement (formerly the Senate Committee on Continuing Education and Public Service) has created a faculty guide for planning and evaluating public engagement activities. The faculty guide is intended to assist faculty members in evaluating the excellence, innovation, impact, and scholarship of public engagement efforts. The guide is included in the attachments of this communication. When public engagement is the primary criterion for promotion and has been so specified at the time of appointment, procedures of the same rigor as those used for outside review of research should be applied to its review. The dossier should include evidence of excellence in public engagement activities provided by the candidate, departmental evaluation, and letters from external evaluators. In this case, the standards used to evaluate public engagement should be similar to the ones used for evaluating research and teaching.

7. Internal Evaluation of Research

The portion of the recommendation focusing on research includes the candidate's statement of research goals and accomplishments, the unit's evaluation of research accomplishments -- emphasizing the two most important publications or creative works -- and the unit's evaluation of future potential.

Candidate Statement

The candidate must provide (in three pages or less) a statement of research goals and accomplishments. If the recommendation is for promotion to associate professor, the statement should focus on research carried out since initial appointment as assistant professor. (The statement may include work as an assistant professor at another institution.) For recommended promotion from associate professor to professor, the statement should

focus on research accomplishments since the last promotion. The candidate should also discuss the relationship of past work to future research plans and to teaching/service duties.

This statement can be very beneficial to external authorities who are asked for written opinions about the candidate, because such a statement provides important context. It allows the reviewer to develop his or her judgments in light of the candidate's vision, goals, and self-assessment of progress. For this reason, the unit is encouraged to ask the candidate to develop the statement at an early stage in the evaluation, so that it can be included with the mailing to outside authorities.

If teaching or public engagement is the primary basis for the recommended promotion, the statement should reflect accomplishments and future plans in teaching or public engagements and how they relate to research.

Unit Evaluation

The department evaluation should articulate the standards and criteria used to judge the candidate's research performance and assess how the candidate's accomplishments meet those criteria. The departmental evaluation of research accomplishments should be an *evaluation*, not merely a description of research. The emphasis should be placed on at least two publications or creative works. Of particular concern are the quality of execution, the significance of the topics, the impact on the field, and the sustainability of the research endeavor. It is recommended that the departmental evaluation should be independent of the evaluations of external reviewers. The individual(s) preparing the departmental evaluation of research should not rely on external letters while preparing their own evaluation.

In some cases, it may be beneficial to supplement the expertise of the departmental evaluation committee by consulting with experts and/or collaborators on campus. This practice is encouraged where it is necessary to provide a fair and complete evaluation of the candidate's contributions. However, it is also essential that the confidentiality of the promotion process be maintained. Therefore, such consultation should be limited to such cases where it is truly necessary. In addition, the person being asked to provide this evaluation must not be in a supervisory position over the candidate (that is, people other than a division head, department head or dean). It is important to solicit such a "letter of reference" specifically and to make sure the person being asked to provide the letter is outside of the candidate's normal reporting chain. This information should be included in the promotion dossier as part of the department's evaluation of research, rather than a separate set of letters of evaluation. However, such letters are not subject to inspection by the candidate.

8. Evaluation of Future Potential

The departmental evaluation of future potential has value only if it is developed in realistic terms. The discussion should focus on the candidate's strategy for developing his or her career as a scholar, and should include an assessment of the probable standing of the candidate within the subfield and larger discipline five years from the present. The evaluation

should also include an assessment of the candidate's future teaching and service roles. In preparing this section, it may be useful for the department evaluators to consult the candidate's research, teaching, and, where appropriate, service statements.

9. Outside Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, Service, Public Engagement, and Creative Activity

a) Number of Letters from Outside Evaluators

Letters from at least five scholars or professional specialists outside the University are required for each nominee. **These letters are critical components of the dossier and play a major role in the decision-making process.** The letters must be appropriate in several dimensions, including:

- sufficient in number. **It is rare that more than six letters need be solicited.** *All letters received must be included in the promotion papers. Likewise, a list of all those evaluators solicited must be included.*
- from appropriately selected individuals from **peer institutions**. (NOTE: *If a unit has sought an evaluation from an individual outside of the university's peer ranks, an explanation must be provided. Letters from individuals not affiliated with a university but who are otherwise knowledgeable about standards and indicators of excellence that are meaningful in an academic environment at our level of achievement should be in addition to the five letters from evaluators from academic institutions.*)
- from individuals of **appropriate** (preferably senior) **rank**.
- from **objective evaluators** without conflicts of interest. For example, letters for tenure should not be solicited from the individual's thesis advisor or current or past collaborators.
- date-stamped upon receipt.

b) Department and Candidate Participation in Selection of Evaluators

Each candidate must be provided an opportunity to nominate external evaluators. The candidate's list of suggested external evaluators must include enough names to guarantee some degree of privacy to the evaluators. That is, the names must not be so few, nor the list so structured, that the candidate can, in effect, direct the inquiry toward particular individuals. **A majority of the external evaluations must come from the department's, rather than the candidate's, nominations.** These provisions suggest, in combination, that the unit request four to eight names from the candidate, that it solicit opinions from no more than two or three of the candidate's choices, and **that it obtain a larger number of opinions from the department's list of nominees.**

The candidate has no privilege of vetoing external reviewers, but may indicate individuals whom he or she considers inappropriately biased. The candidate cannot reasonably request avoidance of more than one or two individuals. It is the unit's responsibility to consider each such request seriously, but the unit is not bound to honor the request. If the questioned evaluator's opinion is deemed particularly relevant to the case, the unit may solicit an opinion.

c) Criteria for Selection of Evaluators

Letters should be solicited only from outside evaluators who are in a position to comment in a discriminating and objective way on the nominee's current research or other professional work and should be from peer institutions that are used for other comparisons such as salaries. There are very good reasons for choosing evaluators from peer (or better) institutions, the principal ones being that such persons are more likely than others to share our standards for promotion and tenure and to understand the environment for scholarship. If a reviewer is not from a peer institution, please explain in the biographical sketch why the evaluator was chosen. The campus P&T Committee takes this matter seriously.

The use of evaluators from industry or commerce, government agencies, or national laboratories should be limited for similar reasons. If such a person is used, his or her letter should not be part of the minimal group of five, but rather, in addition to the letters from evaluators in academe, and a clear statement should be made in the statement of the evaluator's qualifications about his or her knowledge of academic institutions, and why this individual was chosen.

It is expected that evaluators will normally be of a senior rank (full professor or equivalent) and never of a rank lower than the proposed rank of the candidate.

Finally, units should avoid asking for letters from scholars at the same institution, especially if they are in the same department/unit. Sometimes this is unavoidable. A rationale should be provided when that is the case. The goal is to draw from a range of peer institutions in the external evaluations.

d) Objectivity of Evaluators

Letters from close colleagues/collaborators, former professors, and mentors will be discounted by the Campus Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Letters from such individuals are discouraged, essentially on grounds of conflict of interest. If a department uses such an individual, the reasons for the extraordinary choice must be explained in the papers. In considering the use of "colleagues or collaborators" of the candidates, the guiding principle is to avoid recourse if the reviewer stands to benefit from the success of the candidate. In general, one could expect that this would be true if the two shared a common grant, or were close collaborators on common projects, for example. This phrase is not meant to exclude

colleagues who have knowledge of the candidate from ordinary professional contact in a community of scholars.

It is not appropriate to argue that a person cannot be evaluated except by a very small community, all of whom have a demonstrable conflict of interest of the kind described here. Scholarship of the quality that is to be recognized by promotion and tenure on this campus is expected to have a substantial impact; that is, it must affect a community substantially larger than this sort of argument can admit.

e) Procedure for Soliciting Letters

Usually letters requesting an evaluation of the candidate's record are solicited by mail. This section describes language that must be used in the letters soliciting the evaluation. To avoid non-response, departments may wish to request letters of evaluation as early as the preceding spring.

Some departments choose to make prior contact with potential reviewers by telephone or e-mail to ascertain the referee's willingness to provide a review of a candidate. When this type of contact is made, it is essential that neutrality about the candidate be maintained in the telephone or email conversation in the manner required in the written request to provide a review. If the reviewer agrees, the letter of confirmation should include the required language outlined below. In cases where the contacted party declines to serve as a reviewer, the name of the individual contacted must be included with the list of referees (section VI. B) and the reason for declining the request should be provided.

A copy of the letter or letters of solicitation must be in the recommendation package. (If the same letter was sent to several different individuals, only one of the letters of solicitation need be submitted.) **It is extremely important that these letters reflect the exacting standards for promotion and tenure at our institution.**

f) Required Elements of a Letter Soliciting an Evaluation

- **Neutrality.** These letters should be written in a neutral fashion: "We are considering recommending Assistant Professor X for promotion," or "Your comments are requested and will be used to help us decide..." The letters soliciting outside evaluation should request, if possible, an in-depth analysis of the candidate's performance and national stature rather than an overall impression. Thus, letters of solicitation should include a phrase akin to the following:

Please provide us with your analysis of the significance of Professor _____'s work within the canon. It would also be most useful for us if you could provide some comparisons of Professor _____ with her (his) peers.

Letters to outside referees must not include passages such as “We have decided to recommend the promotion of ...” or “Will you please help us to make a case for ...” or “We are very pleased with X; she is an excellent...” Such phrases are likely to bias the response of the outside referee, for they present the evaluator with the appearance of a *fait accompli*.

It is not essential that all letters be identical. For example, it may be appropriate to explain the nature of the candidate’s appointment to an external evaluator not familiar with the University of Illinois in the case of a “Q” appointment. It may also be appropriate to explain the nature of a candidate’s appointment in the case of a predominantly interdisciplinary, teaching, or public engagement record. It is essential, however, that any variation preserves the principle of neutrality.

- Rank. Letters to referees should indicate the rank to which the candidate is being considered for promotion. If the promotion considered is to associate professor, the letter should state that the considered action involves promotion with indefinite tenure. In the case of a “Q” appointee for whom one is soliciting a letter about the granting of tenure without promotion, it is important to specify that the candidate is being considered for “indefinite tenure without change in rank.” Circumstances will vary from one “Q” appointment to another, and in some instances it may be appropriate to provide some context for the letter writer, such as: “After a career spent primarily in industry, [the candidate] joined our faculty with the rank of professor and the understanding that a tenure review would be conducted in his/her third year at Illinois.”
- Candidate’s Academic Activities. External evaluators will be aided in their evaluation by knowledge of the nature of the candidate’s academic activities and the percentage of time allotted to each area of academic activity. Please include a statement in the letter to external evaluators that describes the nature and percentage time of the candidate’s academic activities, as listed on the cover page of the tenure and promotion packet. For example: “The percentage of time allotted to various academic activities for this candidate is 40% research, 40% instruction, and 20% service, engagement and/or outreach.”
- Additional Authorities. The letter to each external evaluator must include the following required language concerning additional authorities:

“The Provost of our campus requests that you provide, in addition to your own comments about this case, the names of two or three other authorities who we might consult about it.”

- Confidentiality. The letter must also include a statement that the confidentiality of the referee’s remarks will be protected to the extent possible within the law. The following language is required:

“The policy of the University of Illinois is to hold in confidence all letters of evaluation from persons outside the institution. Only the committees and administrative officers directly responsible for the decision of concerns here will have access to your letter. It will not be provided to the person on whom you comment unless we are compelled by law to do so.”

- Length of Service during Probationary Period. The letter to each external evaluator must include the following required language to indicate that the evaluator should not consider the faculty member’s length of service during the probationary period.

“Our institution permits one or more extensions (i.e., tenure clock “rollbacks”) during the pre-tenure probationary period. Our policy states that the criteria for promotion and tenure at Illinois are the same for all faculty regardless of length of service during the probationary period.”

- Materials to Include with the Letter. Each evaluator should receive the candidate’s dossier exclusive of evaluative materials and a representative sample of the candidate’s scholarly or creative work. A single manuscript or creative work will rarely suffice as a representative sample.

g) Procedure for Providing Information on Evaluators

The qualifications, including academic ranks or titles and current affiliation, of all outside evaluators must be provided in the promotion papers. The evaluators should be well known in the field; it is generally not appropriate to ask the evaluator to provide a curriculum vitae along with his or her letter of response. If the basis for evaluation is not indicated in the letter of evaluation, please identify why the evaluator is writing the letter (i.e., in what way does the evaluator know the nominee and his or her work) and report any direct relationship (e.g., post-doctoral supervisor, co-investigator, or co-author) between the evaluator and the candidate.

In order to distinguish those referees suggested by the candidate from those chosen by the department, please type after the referee’s name in the biographical sketch either (chosen by the candidate) or (chosen by the department). If an outside evaluator does not respond, briefly indicate the reason, if known.

Negative comments in letters should be addressed (not just dismissed as unfair) by the unit EO since they are sure to attract attention in the course of the review process.

C. Other Notes

1. “Early” Promotion of an Assistant Professor

An assistant professor may be considered for promotion and tenure in any year before the sixth year of the probationary period. Consent of the candidate must be secured in writing before the early promotion and tenure process is initiated.

Although promotion before the sixth year may be warranted in some cases, it is not the norm; it requires clear evidence of teaching, research, and service accomplishments commensurate with sixth year promotion standards. The executive officer’s comments should include an explanation of why early promotion is in the best interest of the University. Unsuccessful candidates for early promotion and tenure may be reviewed again at the normal schedule but an entirely new set of external letters from new reviewers from peer institutions must be sought for the second tenure and promotion review.

Departments should proceed cautiously in considering such cases and should avoid arousing unrealistic expectations. On the one hand, there may be a significant institutional benefit in terms of loyalty, job satisfaction, and retention. On the other hand, an unsuccessful early tenure and promotion bid can lead to disappointment and disaffection on the part of the faculty member. Thus, premature efforts to promote may have exactly the opposite effect from that desired.

2. Revisions of Documents

The narrative and listings in the promotion and tenure dossiers should not be revised in any substantive manner following the reviews at either the department or college levels. Any modifications or additions should be made in addenda to the document along with a brief description from the Executive Officer of the nature and timing of the additions.

D. Assistance

For questions about promotion and tenure criteria, policy or procedures please call the Office of the Provost (333-6677).

III. INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING PROMOTION PAPERS

A. General Instructions

- For each nominee, complete the appropriate cover sheet, and attach it to the recommendation package. Provide all requested data and follow the lettered and numbered headings in the outline. Where there is no information for a specific section, please note “None.” When a section is not relevant to a particular case, please note “Not applicable” (e.g., patents in certain fields).
- All pages should be numbered consecutively from the cover sheet through the letters of recommendation and should end with executive officer’s comments. (Please note that, due to scanning requirements, the outside evaluation section must start on a new page, and the executive officer’s comments, which follow the outside evaluation section, also must start on a new page.) The main outline of papers should be kept to a **maximum** of 30 pages, **exclusive** of the letters of reference. Please note that most promotion recommendations are too long. A promotion that is truly warranted is readily justified in a few pages. Very long justifications suggest weakness and become counterproductive. *Microscopic fonts – i.e., those smaller than 10 point – earn special disfavor.*
- Submit **one final copy with original signatures of the Executive Officers**, one sided and no staples, of each recommendation to the campus level. It may be necessary for units to provide additional copies for the school or college levels.
- Submit one copy of the “Promotion and Tenure Questionnaire” for each unit submitting a recommendation *only if the procedures described therein have been changed from previous practice reported the last time the unit submitted a recommendation*. If the unit’s procedures have not changed from the last time a recommendation was submitted, there is no need to submit the questionnaire.
- Submit one copy of the executive officer and dean statement of the criteria used and procedures followed by the unit (department/college/school) in reviewing the recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. This statement should be submitted separately (not attached to the papers). Only one statement, covering all recommendations from a given unit, is needed, unless different procedures were followed in one or more specific cases.
- For a candidate in a job that is atypical of the college and campus, submit a job description against which performance can be judged.
- For recommendations denied at the college level, please submit two copies of the papers. These should be clearly identified and kept separate from those forwarded with recommendations for approval. These papers should not show the dean’s or director’s signature and they are not considered by the Campus Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

B. Cover Sheet

Please complete all blanks on the cover sheet with particular attention to the following:

- List all colleges, units, and departments in which the candidate holds an appointment.
- Be sure to check the appropriate box indicating if the individual currently holds indefinite tenure, is on a Q appointment, or is on tenure track followed by the year.
- The votes of all committees reviewing the recommendation should be included. If multiple committees vote or the candidate holds a joint appointment in another unit, or if the entire departmental faculty receives and votes on a recommendation from a departmental committee, add a line to report the vote of each group. The EO statement should provide a short explanation of why individuals were recused from the vote (e.g., conflict of interest; participated at a lower level, etc.).
- The signatures of all appropriate department heads and deans or directors should be affixed.
- Be sure the dates of “initial appointment” and “last promotion” at Illinois are listed on the cover sheet.

C. Instructions for the Outline

The following sections describe the *Outline of Promotion Dossier*. A copy of the outline follows as an attachment to this section. **In general, all information should be listed in chronological order from past to present.**

An activity may be listed only once in the dossier. If there is a question about where an activity should be placed, please consult the College for guidance.

1. Personal History and Professional Experience

- A. Educational Background *Beginning with the baccalaureate degree, provide the name of the institution; degree, field of study; date of degree.*
- B. List of Academic Positions since Final Degree *For each position held, list inclusive dates, title, and location for each –University of Illinois and elsewhere.*
- C. Other Professional Employment *Previous and current.*
- D. Honors, Recognitions, and Outstanding Achievements *Fellowships, prizes, etc., that indicate national and international stature in scholarship and engagement appropriate to the rank sought.*

- E. Invited Lectures and Invited Conference Presentations since Last Promotion *For candidates for promotion to Professor, a full (career) list of events may be provided or, in the interest of brevity, a list of only those events since the last promotion may be provided.*
- F. Offices Held in Professional Societies
- G. Editorships of Journals or Other Learned Publications
- H. Grants Received since Last Promotion at UIUC *List principal investigator first, co-principal investigators, granting agency, dates of grant, and dollar amount of grant. For grant with multiple investigators, list amount of effort and award for the candidate. For candidates for promotion to Professor, a full (career) list of grants may be provided or, in the interest of brevity, a list of only those grants received since the last promotion may be provided.*
- I. Review Panels *For governmental agencies, educational institutions, or other organizations.*

2. Publications and Creative Works

When preparing information for the outline given below, please give attention to the following standards:

- Within each category, place items in chronological order from past to most recent, and number each publication.
- List all authors in the same order as in the original publication (i.e., do not show multiple authorship as simply “with Professors x, y, and z”). It is useful to clarify the disciplinary norms for co-authorship elsewhere in the dossier (e.g., in the internal research evaluation, or the EO statement).
- Place a single pound sign (#) before any publication derived from the candidate’s thesis.
- Place a single asterisk (*) before any publication that has undergone stringent editorial review by peers.
- Place a plus sign (+) before any publication that was invited and carries special prestige and recognition.
- The phrase “accepted for publication” should be used only where a written commitment to publish has been received from a publisher, subject only to final technical editing. The term should not be used to describe works still in development, even if a contract or invitation to publish has been offered. Works in the latter category

should be described with the phrase “Incomplete work under contract to...” or comparable wording.

- Provide inclusive page numbers for any manuscript, bulletin, abstract, or review noted by the candidate.
- List all publications and creative works over the course of the candidate’s career (this also applies to a candidate for promotion to Full Professor). For candidates for promotion to Full Professor, please indicate which publications and creative works occurred since the most recent promotion.
- Reprint of papers is not required for review at the campus level.

A. Doctoral thesis title

B. Books Authored or Co-Authored (in print or accepted)

C. Books Edited or Co-Edited (in print or accepted)

D. Chapters in Books (in print or accepted)

E. Monographs (in print or accepted) *Items longer than an article, but shorter than a book. Provide inclusive page numbers for monographs.*

F. Articles in Journals (in print or accepted) *Provide inclusive page numbers for publications in journals.*

G. Creative Works (Exhibitions, Commissions, Competitions, Performances, Designs, Art or Architecture Executed)

H. Patents

I. Bulletins, Reports, or Conference Proceedings (in print or accepted) *Include only if these items are normally considered an important part of the publication record of a scholar or artist in this field. Provide inclusive page numbers for bulletins, reports or conference proceedings.*

J. Abstracts (in print or accepted) *Include only if these items are normally considered an important part of the publication record of a scholar or artist in this field. Provide inclusive page numbers for abstracts.*

K. Book Reviews (in print or accepted) *Include only if these items are normally considered an important part of the publication record of a scholar or artist in this field. Provide inclusive page numbers for book reviews.*

L. Refereed Conference Papers and Presentations

M. Other Specify type.

3. Resident Instruction

A. Summary of Instruction

1) Descriptive Data

Provide information for undergraduate courses, both on and off campus, since the last promotion. For each semester under review, provide a list of courses taught and the number of students enrolled in the course, as in the following sample table (The Division of Management Information posts a complete history of faculty teaching by the end of October each year on its web site at: <https://www-s.dmi.illinois.edu/course>. You may use the data from that site for this section. There is no need to change the format of the DMI report; it can be inserted as it appears on the web and in the example below.)

Division of Management Information
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Course Information System

Definitions
Select new report from front page
Select another instructor
FAQ
Contact us
Log Out

Faculty Teaching History for Promotion & Tenure Packet -- Instructor name
Print this page for the P&T packet.
 This is a list of all sections taught by this faculty member from Fall, 1987 to the current date.
 When there are multiple instructors for one section, the IUs and enrollments are pro-rated using the instructor's contact hours.
[Table Format](#) available for input to Excel.

[Click here to reverse sort](#)

Term	Offer- ing Dept	Course---	Section-	Indiv Instr /Class	IUs	Stu- dents	Class Contact Hours	# of Instr- uctors
SP11	1-361	ENT 599	IND MRB	I	31	3	0	1
SP11	1-383	IB 490	IND MRB	I	3	1	0	1
SP11	1-383	IB 390	IND MRB	I	5	1	0	1
SP11	1-383	IB 109	LEC 2A	C	96.2	37	3	1
SP11	1-383	IB 109	LEC 1	C	130.5	43.5	1.5	2
SP11	1-383	IB 109	LAB 2A	C	0	0	0	2
SP11	1-383	IB 199	DIS MB1	C	35	17	2.2	1
SP11	1-383	IB 109	LAB 2B	C	0	0	0	2
FA10	1-361	ENT 599	IND MRB	I	45	5	0	1
FA10	1-383	IB 390	IND MRB	I	5	1	0	1
FA10	1-383	IB 445	LEC 1	C	33	11	1.5	2
FA10	1-383	IB 444	LEC A	C	83.2	32	3	1
FA10	1-383	IB 444	LEC C	C	21	7	3	1
SU10	1-361	ENT 599	IND MRB	I	14	3	3	1
SP10	1-361	ENT 599	IND MRB	I	64	6	0	1

2) Supervision of Graduate Students

- Please list doctoral and master’s students separately.
- For each graduate student supervised, provide the student’s name and level, dates work was supervised, current status, thesis title if completed, and the student’s

placement (example: Jones, Timothy, Ph.D., 1985, "Analysis of Correlation between CEO Compensation and Return on Investment at Ten Fortune 500 Companies," now at Arthur Andersen).

- List participation on examining committees separately from supervision of a thesis.

3) Supervision of Undergraduate Students

- Please list all undergraduates that have been supervised in research, honors activities, service learning, or public engagement activities.
- For each student, provide the student's name, term during which the activity was supervised, and nature of the activity (e.g., Brown, Keisha, Fall 2012, supervised her senior honor's thesis).

4) Other Contributions to Instructional Programs

Faculty members often make significant instructional contributions of other sorts (e.g., development of course materials used by other instructors, training and supervising teaching assistants, extensive independent study or informal interactions with students). Instructional improvement projects or activities, such as leadership in a significant curricular change, or new courses developed also fall into this category. Please describe noteworthy contributions made by the candidate.

B. Evaluation of Instruction

1) Student ICES Course Evaluation Questionnaires

This information is available from the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning. It is most convenient to use the summary table of ICES data available from the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning (an ICES "Longitudinal Profile"). Unit executive officers, or the instructor, must request this summary from the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning ([http://citl.illinois.edu/services/for-instructors/instructor-and-course-evaluation-system-\(ices\)/longitudinal-profiles](http://citl.illinois.edu/services/for-instructors/instructor-and-course-evaluation-system-(ices)/longitudinal-profiles)). For those being promoted from associate to full professor, ICES scores from the last promotion to the present are all that are needed. If the request is from the unit executive officer, only data previously released to the department will be included. If the request comes directly from the instructor, all ICES results will be included on the Longitudinal Profile.

Generally, it is not useful to provide selected student comments from ICES forms, for essentially the same reason that anecdotal comments from other sources are of limited value. Review committees have no ability to judge either the relative

frequency of favorable comments or the degree to which they might be offset by unfavorable commentary.

The following is a sample table from the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning:

INSTRUCTOR NAME: JOHN DOE
DEPT. NAME: ANY DEPARTMENT

PRIOR TO 1987: RATING RANGE 1-6

SEMESTER	COURSE NO.	NO. OF FORMS	ELECT. MIXED REQD.	MEAN ITEM 2	MEAN ITEM 3	NORM GROUP ITEM 2	NORM GROUP ITEM 3
FALL1978	424	14	E	5.90	5.90	HIGH	HIGH
SPNG1978	105	19	R	4.78	4.36	AVG	LO AVG
SPNG1978	245	30	E	5.62	5.21	HI AVG	AVG
SPNG1978	321	19	M	5.89	5.27	HIGH	HI AVG
FALL1979	323	15	E	6.00	5.86	HIGH	HIGH
SPNG1980	245	22	E	5.50	5.18	AVG	AVG
SPNG1980	297	15	M	5.73	5.40	HI AVG	HI AVG
FALL1981	246	20	E	5.70	5.30	HI AVG	AVG
FALL1981	321	32	M	5.83	5.60	HIGH	HIGH
SPNG1981	355	14	M	5.75	5.41	HIGH	HI AVG
SPNG1981	424	8	E	5.75	5.62	HI AVG	HI AVG
FALL1982	246	26	E	5.26	5.15	AVG	AVG
FALL1982	297	15	M	5.73	5.60	HI AVG	HIGH
SPNG1982	209	28	M	5.60	5.42	HI AVG	HI AVG
SPNG1982	323	12	M	5.83	5.83	HIGH	HIGH
FALL1983	246	33	E	5.84	5.40	HIGH	HI AVG
FALL1983	321	46	M	5.60	5.13	HI AVG	AVG
SPNG1983	209	45	R	5.67	5.32	HI AVG	HI AVG
SPNG1983	321	31	M	5.62	5.32	HI AVG	HI AVG
SPNG1985	245	25	E	5.76	5.48	HI AVG	HI AVG
SPNG1985	321	20	M	5.89	5.47	HIGH	HI AVG
FALL1986	297	12	M	5.81	5.18	HIGH	HI AVG
FALL1986	323	13	M	5.69	5.61	HI AVG	HIGH
SPNG1986	245	28	M	5.53	5.32	HI AVG	HI AVG
SPNG1986	321	27	M	5.76	5.57	HIGH	HIGH

1987 TO PRESENT: RATING RANGE 1-5

SEMESTER	COURSE NO.	NO. OF FORMS	ELECT. MIXED REQD.	MEAN ITEM 1	MEAN ITEM 2	NORM GROUP ITEM 1	NORM GROUP ITEM 2
SPNG1987	297	11	M	4.77	4.55	HIGH	HI AVG
SPNG1987	424	11	E	4.80	4.70	HI AVG	HI AVG
FALL1988	246	30	M	4.46	4.28	AVG	AVG
FALL1988	246	26	E	4.58	4.41	HI AVG	AVG
SPNG1988	245	29	E	4.82	4.57	HIGH	HI AVG
SPNG1988	321	28	M	4.68	4.36	HI AVG	AVG
SPNG1989	321	24	M	4.78	4.56	HIGH	HI AVG
FALL1990	297	9	M	4.88	4.77	HIGH	HIGH
SPNG1990	209	90	R	4.00	3.76	AVG	AVG
FALL1991	321	25	M	4.73	4.43	HI AVG	HI AVG
SPNG1991	355	21	M	4.52	4.42	HI AVG	HI AVG
FALL1992	209	116	R	4.27	4.00	AVG	AVG
FALL1992	321	31	M	4.48	4.17	HI AVG	AVG
SPNG1992	424	13	E	4.75	4.58	HI AVG	HI AVG
FALL1993	321	27	M	4.64	4.40	HI AVG	HI AVG

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS • URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
ACADEMIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

If the standard report from the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning is not employed, please develop the report with attention to the following:

- a) Raw data will not be accepted.
- b) Provide data for each semester and for each course under review (since last promotion).
- c) Provide departmental norm when possible.

2) Candidate's Teaching Activities Report and Self-Review

The candidate must provide a personal statement of teaching philosophy, methods, strengths, problems, goals and other material in a manner that will present colleagues with a context for interpreting other evaluative information. *This statement should not exceed three pages.*

3) Departmental Evaluation of Teaching, Advising, and Student Mentoring

- The departmental evaluation must include a review of course documents, including instructional materials such as syllabi, bibliographies, textbooks, test questions, grading policies and procedures. Please provide the name of the person(s) who developed the evaluation.
- Information on the number of students dropping each course and the reasons for doing so (if known), is often useful. Identification of withdrawals, for example, can be helpful in pointing out unusually large decreases in the number of students throughout the semester (perhaps compared to others teaching the same course). This information can serve as a flag interpreting the end-of-course student ratings as well as a topic of discussion with the instructor regarding the reasons for dramatic enrollment shifts. Interpretation should be made cautiously, however, since students drop courses for several reasons and some may have little relevance to the instructor or course.
- Departments are encouraged to report results of other effective means for evaluating instructional performance, such as observation by peers. Where the candidate's teaching contributions have achieved significant recognition outside the campus, the department may wish to invite letters from external evaluators who are knowledgeable of those contributions as well as of the candidate's other scholarly work. For each peer reviewer whose evaluation is included, please provide a brief statement (one to two sentences) about the reasons for selecting the reviewer to evaluate teaching.

4. Service (Public Engagement, Professional/Disciplinary, and University)

All faculty members should have three types of service included in Section IV of the dossier: public engagement, professional/disciplinary, and University/campus.

PLEASE NOTE: For faculty members whose public engagement activities constitute a substantial portion of their University-assigned responsibilities and thus public engagements has been identified as a primary criterion for promotion, the dossier should follow the guidelines in number 5 titled **Alternative to #4. Service for Faculty Members Who Have Public Engagement as a Primary Criterion for Promotion.**

A. Summary of Service

1) Public Engagement

Definition: Public engagement is the application for the public good of the knowledge and expertise of a faculty or staff member to issues of societal importance. Typically, this activity is done in collaboration with others both within and outside of the university. The activity may enrich research and teaching as well as lead to new directions within the university. Public engagement falls under the service mission of the university.

Summary: Indicate public engagement and outreach activities performed in assisting agencies, schools, businesses, governmental agencies or other groups and individuals who benefit from the knowledge, information and services resident within the University community. *To be recognized as public engagement, activities should:*

- a) Contribute to the public welfare or the common good.
- b) Call upon the faculty member's academic, professional, or creative expertise.
- c) Directly address or respond to societal problems, issues, interests or concerns.

2) Service to Disciplinary and Professional Societies or Associations

List and describe service activities that are not included in Section I, Personal History and Professional Experience.

3) University/Campus Service

Indicate service on departmental, college, campus and university committees as well as administrative assignments.

B. Evaluation of Service

Please provide the name of the person(s) who developed the evaluation.

- Public Engagement – Provide evidence of quality and impact; describe dissemination of the public service work through publications and adoption by others; if appropriate, illustrate how the public service activities are integrated with research and/or teaching.
- Service to Disciplinary and Professional Societies or Associations – Provide evidence of major contributions which affected the societies/associations beyond routine committee and officer service; include recognition and honors.

- University/Campus Service – Provide evidence of impact of contributions to the department, college, campus or University.

Alternative #4 – Service for Faculty Members who have Public Engagement as a Primary Criterion for Promotion

The executive officer of those faculty members whose public engagement responsibilities constitute a substantial portion of their University-assigned responsibilities is urged to refer to A Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process (2000) for more complete guidelines on the expectations for documenting public engagement activities. The guide can be found in the attachments to this communication.

A. Summary of Service

1) Public Engagement

If public engagement is the primary criterion for promotion and has been so specified at the time of appointment, procedures of the same rigor as those used for evaluating research and teaching should be used for its review. In this case, the candidate must prepare a statement of public engagement goals and accomplishments following the guidelines provided below under Item a). Also, a detailed departmental evaluation of the candidate's public engagement activities following the guidelines in Item b) must be prepared. Finally, a departmental evaluation of future potential must be prepared according to the guidelines in Item c).

a) Candidate's Statement of Public Engagement Goals and Accomplishments

The candidate must provide (in three pages or fewer) a statement of public engagement goals and accomplishments. If the recommendation is for promotion to associate professor, the statement should include public engagement accomplishments since appointment as assistant professor (and may include work as an assistant professor at another institution). For recommended promotion from associate professor to full professor, the statement should include public engagement accomplishments since the last promotion.

The statement should tie together past public engagement accomplishments and how they relate to future public engagement plans and to research/teaching duties.

The statement should provide evidence that the public engagement activities or programs have had a significant impact on and been of mutual benefit to Illinois and to the partner(s). It should also indicate how the activity is to be sustained over time.

The statement should reflect how these activities relate to teaching and research.

b) Departmental Evaluation of Public Engagement Activities

Please provide the name of the person who developed the evaluation.

This evaluation should be based on peer observation, standardized evaluation metrics completed by client groups (as appropriate), evaluative interviews with clients, focus groups of clients convened for the purpose of evaluation, and up to three letters of evaluation from qualified academic and non-academic authorities (see the Faculty Handbook for further discussion of possible evaluation procedures and methods).

This portion of the dossier must include independent, verifiable, and specific evidence of excellence and impact. This evidence may point to: documented changes in organizational or individual practices in the client/partner organization; change(s) in human behavior, specific economic benefits, specific improvements in the human condition and/or organizational practices (e.g., health, safety, quality of life, organizational environment, best practices), and/or specific environmental benefits.

c) Departmental Evaluation of Future Potential

Please provide the name of the person(s) who developed the evaluation.

Evaluate the candidate's strategy for developing his or her public engagement beyond recent accomplishments. Assess, in realistic terms, the probable impact of *the candidate in his or her public engagement activities five years from now.*

2) Service to Disciplinary and Professional Societies or Associations

List and describe service activities that are not included in Section I, Personal History and Professional Experience.

3) University/Campus Service

Indicate service on departmental, college, campus and university committees as well as administrative assignments.

B. Evaluation of Disciplinary/Professional and University/Campus Service

Please provide the name of the person who developed the evaluation.

1. Service to Disciplinary and Professional Societies or Associations

Provide evidence of major contributions which affected the societies/associations beyond routine committee and officer service; include recognition and honors.

2. University/Campus Service

Provide evidence of impact of contributions to the department, college, campus or University.

5. Research

A. Candidate's Statement of Research Goals and Accomplishments

- The candidate must provide (in three pages or fewer) a statement of research goals and accomplishments. If the recommendation is for promotion to associate professor, the statement should focus primarily on research accomplishments since first appointment as assistant professor (and may include work as an assistant professor at another institution). *For recommended promotion from associate professor to professor, the statement should focus primarily on research accomplishments since the last promotion.*
- The statement should tie together past research and how it relates to future research plans and to teaching/service duties.
- If teaching or public engagement is the primary basis for the recommended promotion, the statement must reflect accomplishments and future plans in teaching or public engagement and how they relate to the research activity.

B. Departmental Evaluation of Research Accomplishments

- Please provide the name of the person(s) who developed the evaluation.
- Research should be evaluated (not merely described) with emphasis on at least two publications or creative works.
- The evaluation should articulate the standards and criteria used to judge the candidate's research performance and assess how the candidate's accomplishments meet those criteria.
- The evaluation should address the dimensions of quality of execution, significance of topic, and impact on the field.
- It is recommended that the departmental evaluation should be independent of the evaluations of external reviewers. The individuals preparing the departmental evaluation of research should not rely on external letters while preparing their own evaluation.

- If relevant, succinctly note disciplinary norms for co-authorship—that is, alphabetical order, lead author first, lead author last, etc.

C. Departmental Evaluation of Future Potential

- Please provide the name of the person(s) who developed the evaluation.
- Evaluate the candidate’s strategy for developing his or her research beyond recent accomplishments.
- Evaluate the candidate’s potential to excel in teaching and service.
- Assess, in realistic terms, the probable standing of the candidate in his or her field five years from now.

6. External Evaluations

A. Sample Letter(s) to External Evaluators

Include a copy of the letter (or letters, if different versions) used to solicit these outside evaluations. As the letter is composed, please attend to the following points:

- Be sure the letter is neutral in tone.
- Indicate the rank to which the candidate is being promoted and if the promotion would include the awarding of indefinite tenure.
- Ask explicitly for the evaluator to describe the basis for his/her knowledge of the candidate and the candidate’s work.
- Include the following required language to request from the evaluator the names of additional people who can speak authoritatively about the work of the candidate.

“The Provost of our campus requests that you provide, in addition to your own comments about this case, the names of two or three other authorities who might be consulted about it.”

- Use the following required language to indicate that the referee’s response will be protected as confidential:

“The policy of the University of Illinois is to hold in confidence all letters of evaluation from persons outside the institution. Only the committees and administrative officers directly responsible for the decision of concern here will have access to your letter. It will not be provided to the person on whom you comment unless we are compelled by law to do so.”

- Use the following required language to indicate that the evaluator should not consider the faculty member's length of service during the probationary period.

“Our institution permits one or more extensions (i.e., tenure clock “rollbacks”) during the pre-tenure probationary period. Our policy states that the criteria for promotion and tenure at Illinois are the same for all faculty regardless of length of service during the probationary period.”

B. Qualifications of the External Evaluators

- On one page, list the names, addresses, and affiliations of all scholars or professional specialists outside the University of Illinois from whom you have solicited letters of evaluation.
- **A majority of the external evaluations must come from the department's, rather than the candidate's, nominations.** These provisions suggest, in combination, that the unit request four to eight names from the candidate, that it solicit opinions from no more than two or three of the candidate's choices, and **that it obtain a larger number of opinions from others.**
- In order to distinguish those referees chosen by the candidate from those chosen by the department, please add after the referee's name either “(chosen by the candidate)” or “(chosen by the department).”
- Provide a brief description of the qualifications of each outside referee (i.e., rank, position, and credentials.)
- The outside evaluators should be chosen from institutions the department might legitimately identify as peer institutions for other purposes such as salary comparisons. If the evaluator is not from such a peer institution, please explain in the description of the evaluator why the choice was made.
- Include a statement of how the referee knows the candidate and his/her work if this is not obvious from the evaluator's letter.
- If a letter of evaluation was not received from someone who was asked to provide one, please explain why there was no response.

C. External Letters

- Letters from each outside reviewer should be numbered inclusively within the recommendation packet.
- All letters received in response to the unit's request for external evaluation must be included.

- Letters must be date-stamped upon receipt.

7. Comments by the Unit Executive Officer

In the Comments section, the unit executive officer should indicate succinctly why the department will be strengthened and how the best interests of the University will be served by the promotion of the candidate, especially if the promotion includes indefinite tenure.

The Comments section also provides the EO with the opportunity to discuss any aspects of the candidate's record not covered in the preceding sections and to address any possible concerns raised in the evaluation process, including (but not limited to):

- any aspect of the candidate's record that has not been addressed in the dossier;
- any aspects of the candidate's research, teaching, or service record that may raise questions about the candidate's ability to sustain a high level of productivity;
- recusals in the evaluation process;
- split votes in the unit;
- the frequency of and reasons for declines by potential external evaluators;
- conflicts of interest in the external letters (e.g., if the external evaluator collaborated with the candidate or served in an advisory capacity);
- negative comments or recommendations by the external evaluators;
- if an "early" promotion to Associate, the reasons for that action;
- if promotion to Full Professor, justification for the timing of the recommendation.

In recommending the case to the next level, it is incumbent on the EO to explain why the case should go forward and is in the best interest of the University.

The unit executive officer should include in his/her comments any new evidence that has led to the submission of a promotion recommendation that had been denied previously.

As the "Special Comments by the Unit Executive Officer" addresses and clarifies information within the promotion dossier, as well as information in the letters of reference, it is important that this section be placed at the end of the packet. Please be sure the executive officer's comments are the last item in the promotion packet, unless there is a need for Special Comments by the Dean (see below).

8. Special Comments by the Dean (only when needed)

When a case is forwarded for campus review after significant questions were raised during its review at the college or school level, or by external evaluators, or it received a split vote, it is imperative that the Dean of the submitting unit provide commentary on the case for successive reviewers. This commentary should explain the merits of the case and address forthrightly its strengths and weaknesses. To formulate this commentary, the Dean may need to be present during the campus committee's discussion of the merits of the case. Special comments from the Dean are needed only when there are significant questions raised at the college/school level and/or there is a split vote by the college-level review committee.

IV. ASSISTANCE

For questions about promotion and tenure criteria, policy or procedures please call the Office of the Provost (333-6677).

V. ATTACHMENTS

1. Checklist for Transmittal of Recommendation
2. Recommendation for Promotion and Tenure (Cover Sheet and Outline)
3. A Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process
4. Senate Promotion and Tenure Information Questionnaire
5. Sample Letter to External Evaluator