

AGENDA

Senate of the Urbana-Champaign Campus
November 17, 2014; 3:10 pm
Illini Union – Illini Room A

- I. **Call to Order** – Abbas Benmamoun, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs
- II. **Approval of Minutes** –October 20, 2014
- III. **Senate Executive Committee Report** – Chair Roy Campbell
- IV. **Chancellor’s Remarks** – Abbas Benmamoun, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs
- V. **Questions/Discussion**
- VI. **Consent Agenda**

These items will only be distributed via www.senate.illinois.edu/20141117.asp. If a senator wishes to move an item from the Consent Agenda to Proposals and have copies at the meeting, they must notify the Senate Office at least two business days before the meeting. Any senator can ask to have any item moved from the Consent Agenda to Proposals.

EP.15.15	Proposal to Revise the Biochemistry Specialized Curriculum	Educational Policy (G. Miller, Chair)
EP.15.16	Revision to the Major in the Science and Letters Curriculum: BALAS Creative Writing, Department of English, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Educational Policy (G. Miller, Chair)
EP.15.18	Proposal to Rename the Center for Biophysics and Computational Biology & Rename MS and PhD	Educational Policy (G. Miller, Chair)
EP.15.23	Proposal from the College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences to eliminate the Food Industry and Business concentration in the Bachelor of Science in Food Science and Human Nutrition	Educational Policy (G. Miller, Chair)
EP.15.24	Proposal from the College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences to establish a minor in Adult Development	Educational Policy (G. Miller, Chair)

VII. Proposals (enclosed)

CC.15.06	Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate	Committee on Committees (P. Kalita)	1
SP.15.07	Revisions to the <i>Statutes</i> , Article X, Section 2 – Academic Freedom (Final; Action)	University Statutes and Senate Procedures (W. Maher)	3

VIII. Current Benefits Issues (5 min.)– John Kindt, Chair of Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits**IX. Reports (enclosed)**

HE.15.02	FAC/ IBHE Report – October 2014	A. Aminmansour	9
UC.15.04	USC Report – October 8, 2014	J. Tolliver	11
SC.15.05	New Provost Communications <i>Communication #26</i> : Promotion to Teaching, Research or Clinical Associate or Full Professor Titles <i>Communication #27</i> : Shared Governance for Academic Units	R. Campbell	13

X. New Business**XI. Adjournment**

Minutes
Urbana-Champaign Senate Meeting
October 20, 2014

A regular meeting of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Senate was called to order at 3:11 pm in the Illini Union Ballroom with Chancellor Phyllis Wise presiding and Professor Emeritus H. George Friedman, Jr. as Parliamentarian.

Approval of Minutes

10/20/14-01 The minutes from September 22, 2014 were approved as written.

Senate Executive Committee Report

Roy Campbell (ENGR), faculty senator and Chair of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) noted that due to unfinished business from the September Senate meeting, today's agenda is very full. Chair Campbell requested that Senate members adhere to the agenda in order to finish all Senate business presented on the agenda.

Tellers for the meeting were faculty senators Bettina Francis (LAS), and student senator Joshua Baalman (LAS).

Chancellor's Remarks

Chancellor Phyllis Wise noted that approximately 150 faculty members were recruited last year and approximately 140 more searches have been launched. The three Visioning Future Excellence themes that will be used for cluster hiring are Health and Wellness, Social Equality and Cultural Understanding, and Energy and the Environment.

The [Business Plan to Establish a College of Medicine in Urbana-Champaign](#) was posted on the Office of the Chancellor website. The final proposal to establish the College of Medicine will be submitted to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (EPC) for approval and then to the full Senate for further discussion.

Questions/Discussion

None

Old Business

a. Proposals

10/20/14-02 CC.15.03* Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate

10/20/14-03 On behalf of the Senate Committee on Committees, Chair Kalita moved approval of the slate of nominees on proposal CC.15.03.

10/20/14-04 Robert Warrior (LAS) was nominated from the floor to fill the faculty vacancy on the Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion. Warrior's signed statement of willingness to serve* if elected was submitted. There were no more floor nominations and nominations were closed.

10/20/14-05 Tellers reported the following vote totals: Warrior 65, Bauer 66. Bauer was elected to serve on the Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion.

10/20/14-06 The remainder of the slate of nominees on proposal CC.15.03 were approved by voice.

- 10/20/14-07 CC.15.04* Nomination to the State Universities Retirement System Members Advisory Committee (SURSMAC)
- 10/20/14-08 On behalf of the Senate Committee on Committees, Chair Kalita moved approval of the nominee on proposal CC.15.04. There were no floor nominations and nominations were closed.
- 10/20/14-09 The nominee on proposal CC.15.04 was approved by voice.
- 10/20/14-10 SP.15.05* Proposed Revision to *Standing Rule* 11.B – Election of a Senate Executive Committee Member from the Committee on the University Senates Conference
- 10/20/14-11 On behalf of the Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures (USSP), Chair Maher moved approval of proposal SP.15.05. Maher noted that proposal SP.15.05 is straight forward and deletes the word “paper” in order to allow for electronic voting in the election of a Senate Executive Committee member from the Committee on the University Senates Conference.
- 10/20/14-12 By voice, proposal SP.15.05 was approved.
- 10/20/14-13 RS.15.01* Resolution on Uniform Pay for Specialized Faculty
- 10/20/14-14 Faculty senator Gilmore (LAS) moved approval of proposal RS.15.01. The motion was seconded and discussion followed.
- Faculty senator Gilmore (LAS) noted that the non-tenure track faculty unionized over the summer. Riedel (LAS) asked that the Senate support this resolution so that all non-tenure track faculty have access to promotional lines outline in Provost Communication #25. Riedel (LAS) added that some departments were quick to act while others appear to be slow to take action or not taking action at all. All non-tenure track faculty should be treated equally and should receive the appropriate pay. Riedel (LAS) expressed her concern that not all non-tenure track faculty received appropriate salary adjustments.
- Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs Abbas Benmamoun responded that the Office of the Provost worked with Academic Human Resources (AHR) to ensure that all promotional salary increases were implemented. The majority of the increases were implemented, but three were not implemented. AHR has corrected the omission and raises were put into effect immediately. AHR will inform the Office of the Provost if any other cases are found. The salary floor has also been implemented. Benmamoun noted that if anyone is aware of situations of promotional raises or salary floor not being implemented the cases should be reported to the Office of the Provost.
- 10/20/14-15 By voice, the motion to approve resolution RS.15.01 was approved.
- 10/20/14-16 RS.15.03* Senate Resolution on the SEC Resolution on Ad Hoc Committee Formation
- 10/20/14-17 Faculty senator Ruggles (FAA) moved approval of proposal RS.15.03. The motion was seconded and a robust discussion followed. Ruggles (FAA) gave her opinion that the SEC Resolution that was passed on August 25, 2014 was flawed. Graber (AHS) noted that the quote in paragraph three of Resolution 15.03 is incorrect. Graber noted that the final decision does not rest with the Provost, but rather with the Board of Trustees (BOT). Academic Professional senator Roberts-Lieb (AP) noted that Provost Communication #9 does not speak to appointments and the Provost Communication #26 that the resolution refers to does not exist at this time. Burbules (EDUC) noted that the SEC task force is not expanding the power of the Chancellor, but rather would be making recommendations to the Senate on the process that should be followed when the Chancellor does not feel she can send a hiring decision forward to the BOT. Ruggles (FAA) gave her opinion that there are current committees that could address the issues charged to the SEC task force. Therefore, there is no reason for the SEC task force.

10/20/14-18 The motion to approve resolution 15.03 failed by voice.

b. Reports

10/20/14-19 HE.14.09* FAC/ IBHE Report – May 2014
 10/20/14-20 HE.14.10* FAC/ IBHE Report – June 2014
 10/20/14-21 EP.15.12* Report of Administrative Approvals through August 25, 2014
 10/20/14-22 SC.15.03* BOT Observer Report – September 11, 2014
 10/20/14-23 UC.15.01* USC Report – August 25, 2014

Consent Agenda

Hearing no objections, the following proposals were approved by unanimous consent.

10/20/14-24 EP.15.17* Proposal to Remove the Masters of Science in Human Factors Degree Program
 10/20/14-25 EP.15.19* Proposal to Revise Requirements for the Graduate Concentration in Writing Studies offered through the Center for Writing Studies

Proposals (enclosed)

10/20/14-26 CC.15.05* Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate and the Military Education Council

10/20/14-27 On behalf of the Senate Committee on Committees, Chair Kalita moved approval of the slate of nominees on proposal CC.15.05. No nominations from the floor and nominations were declared closed.

10/20/14-28 The motion to approve proposal CC.15.05 was approved by voice.

10/20/14-29 SC.15.04* Resolution in Support of the Council of Illinois University Senates “Statement of Concern”

On behalf of the SEC, Chair Campbell moved approval of SC.15.04. Melissa Madsen, member of SEC and Council on Academic Professionals (CAP) President, gave additional details from the Council of Illinois University Senates (CIUS) recent meeting where the “Statement of Concern” was drafted.

10/20/14-30 The motion to approve proposal SC.15.04 was approved unanimously by voice.

10/20/14-31 SP.14.03* Amendments to Nicknames in the *Senate Election Rules for the Student Electorate*

10/20/14-32 On behalf of the Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures (USSP), Chair Maher moved approval of proposal SP.14.03. Chair Maher noted that this proposal was submitted to the USSP by student senators. This proposal comes to the Senate with the USSP’s endorsement.

10/20/14-33 The motion to approve proposal SP.14.03 was approved unanimously by voice.

10/20/14-34 SP.14.12* Revision to *Standing Rule 13*

10/20/14-35 On behalf of the USSP, Chair Maher moved approval of proposal SP.14.12. Maher noted the EPC brought forward the suggested changes to *Standing Rule 13* to USSP. EPC and USSP worked together to call for a review process that would occur earlier in the process of termination, separation, transfer, merger, or change in status of any academic unit. Maher added that being informed of an academic unit’s decision could bring a deliberative conversation forward. Oh behalf of EPC, Francis (LAS) noted that there has to be a balance between too tight verses too loose language. Additional discussion followed.

- 10/20/14-36 Due to the additional discussion, Maher suggested that if the Senate was not prepared to vote on the proposal, the proposal could be sent back to USSP for further revision. Maher made a motion to send proposal SP.14.12 back to committee.
- 10/20/14-37 The motion to send SP.14.12 back to committee failed by voice.
- 10/20/14-38 Motion to approve SP.14.12 was approved by voice.
- 10/20/14-39 SP.15.07* Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article X, Section 2 – Academic Freedom (First Reading; Information)
- 10/20/14-40 Changes to the University *Statutes* requires two readings. The first reading is informational and for discussion only. This proposal will be presented to the Senate at the next regular meeting for action. Maher noted the original proposal was submitted in 2010. The original proposed amendments were approved by the Urbana Senate and the version approved by the Urbana campus was also approved at the Chicago and Springfield campuses. There was additional discussion at the University Senates Conference (USC) and the original proposal did not go forward. The SP.15.07 proposal is being treated as a new proposal. This proposal would create recourse for faculty that think their academic freedom has been infringed upon. Tolliver (LAS) noted that the proposed changes were put forward for reasons of consistency and for reasons of better inclusion of colleagues.
- 10/20/14-41 RS.15.02* Resolution on Academic Freedom and Civility
- 10/20/14-42 Rabin moved approval of RS.15.02. The motion was seconded and discussion followed.
- Wise noted that massmails were never intended to be a mechanism in which policy is set or changes, but rather to communicate to the community at large. Several faculty senators expressed concern that some language in resolution 15.02 was incorrect.
- AFT committee member and faculty senator Steinburg (LAS) read the following statement on behalf of the AFT.
- The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT) endorses Senate Resolution 15.02 and urges its passage. The observance of “civility” in interpersonal communication is surely desirable and CAFT sees nothing amiss in institutional leaders saying so. However, the texts of the Chancellor’s and Trustees’ statements could be read to suggest that what was enjoined is not observance of a desirable norm, but of an enforceable rule of conduct.
- More than twenty years ago the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) issued *On Freedom of Expression and Campus Speech Codes* in the wake of efforts on numerous campuses to promulgate rules the terms of which are echoed in the Chancellor’s and Trustees’ messages. The AAUP’s *Statement* captures the tenor of the debate and the reasons why “civility”, desirable as matter of etiquette, cannot be deployed as a standard of conduct.
- An institution of higher education fails in its mission if it asserts the power to proscribe ideas, and uncivil speech, howsoever repugnant at times, expresses ideas. CAFT appreciates that the value of emotive, even hate-laden speech is of a rather low order. Yet, as the AAUP *Statement* observed, a university
- sets a perilous course if it seeks to differentiate between high-value and low-value speech, or to choose which groups are to be protected by curbing the speech of others. A speech code unavoidably implies an institutional competence to distinguish permissible expression of hateful thought from what is proscribed as thoughtless hate.
- Inevitably, the university will be drawn to decide which groups are worthy of solicitude and which are not, what words are unacceptably offensive and what are within the margin of acceptability.

“Distinctions of this type” the AAUP *Statement* observes, “are neither practicable nor principled; their very fragility underscores why institutions devoted to freedom of thought and expression ought not adopt an institutionalized coercion of silence.”

CAFT notes in passing that campus speech codes have been held unconstitutional on grounds of their very generality and sweep, as abridging freedom of expression.* However, the position CAFT adopts here is predicated firmly on academic, not legal grounds. The University of Illinois cannot be faithful to its mission, as reflected in its *Statutes*, by banning speech.

10/20/14-43 By show of hands the motion to approve RS.15.02 failed.

Reports

10/20/14-44 HE.15.01* FAC/ IBHE Report – September 19, 2014

10/20/14-45 EP.15.21* Report of Administrative Approvals: August 25 – October 13, 2014

10/20/14-46 UC.15.02* USC Report – September 9-10, 2014

10/20/14-47 UC.15.03* Proposed Revisions to the *Statutes*

Friedman, member of USSP, noted that the proposed revisions to the *Statutes* will begin the review process by the USSP this week. Friedman noted that some proposed changes appear trivial while others could possibly be significant. USSP will most likely bring the proposed changes to the *Statutes* to the full Senate in groups as suggested by the USC. The consensus of USSP members is that a thorough examination is more important than the proposed schedule, but the committee will attempt to perform the thorough examination within the proposed schedule.

New Business

None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 pm.

Jenny Roether, Senate Clerk

*Filed with the Senate Clerk and incorporated by reference in these minutes.

* Doe v. University of Michigan, 721 F.Supp.2d 852 (E.D. Mich. 1989); UWM Post, Inc. v. Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, 774 F.Supp.2d 1163 (E.D. Wis. 1991); Blair v. Shippensburg University, 280 F.Supp.2d 357 (M.D. Pa. 2003); College Republicans at San Francisco State Univ. v. Reed, 523 F.Supp.2d 1005 (N.D. Cal. 2007).

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE
Committee on Committees
(Final; Action)

CC.15.06 Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate

Educational Policy

To fill two student vacancies created by the resignation of James Tandaric (LAS) and Mitch Dickey (LAS).

Shari Hopkins	GRAD	Term Expires 2015
Dean Meyer	LAS	Term Expires 2015

Licensing Advisory Committee, *ad hoc*

To fill three student vacancies created by term expiration.

Arielle Rausin	BUS	Term Expires 2015
Andrew Woronowicz	LAS	Term Expires 2015

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Prasanta Kalita, Chair
Lisa Monda-Amaya
Sara Benson
Mitch Dickey
William Gropp
Sarah Hochman
Calvin Lear
Randy McCarthy
Jenny Roether, *ex officio*

Nominations from the floor must be accompanied by the nominee's signed statement of willingness to serve if elected. The statement shall be dated and include the name of the position to be filled. If present, the nominee's oral statement will suffice.

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures
(Final; Action)

SP.15.07 Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article X, Section 2 – Academic Freedom

BACKGROUND

On December 6, 2010, the Urbana-Champaign Senate voted to approve SP.10.11 authorizing changes to the *University Statutes*, Article X, Section 2 governing Academic Freedom. Specifically, SP.10.11 included in its definition of academic freedom activities addressing “any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance.” In addition, SP.10.11 extended the provisions governing academic freedom to all academic staff members. Appendix A contains the text of SP.10.11.

After the Senates for the Chicago and Springfield campuses adopted these changes to the *University Statutes*, the University Senates Conference (USC) forwarded SP.10.11 to the President. After considering these amendments, the President and his staff raised concerns about the language. A small working group including members of USC and the President’s staff met to make revisions to address those concerns. USC approved those revisions, designated ST-72 and presented in this proposal, on March 18, 2014. In forwarding ST-72 to the three campuses, the Chair of USC stated that ST-72 offered “stronger language that better defines who is covered in Article X, Section 2 and removes ambiguity between references to academic freedom and to First Amendment rights.” Appendix A also contains the text of ST-72.

The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AFT) reviewed ST-72 and concluded that the proposed language clarified the objectives of the original amendments to Article X – extending academic freedom to participation in shared governance. AFT did not address the proposed changes to the coverage for academic staff.

In its review of ST-72, the Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures (USSP) regrets that ST-72 restricts coverage to academic staff members “directly engaged in teaching and research,” a limitation that did not appear in SP.10.11 as previously adopted. In addition, USSP members found the phrasing of the paragraph 2.a of SP.10.11 preferable because it was clearer and more straightforward. Yet most members thought that the changes did not affect the meaning of academic freedom in a significant way. USSP also notes that the last sentence of paragraph 2.a of SP.10.11 has been moved to paragraph 2.c, and the last sentence of paragraph 2.c has been incorporated into paragraph 2.d; these rearrangements may somewhat clarify the text, and do not seem to change its meaning.

RECOMMENDATION

The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures and the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure recommend approval of the following revisions to the *Statutes*. Text to be added is underscored and text to be deleted is indicated by ~~strikeout~~ (e.g., ~~sample text for deletion~~).

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE *STATUTES*, ARTICLE X, SECTION 2

- 1
2 Section 2. Academic Freedom
3
4 a. Academic freedom includes the freedom to teach, both in and outside the classroom, to conduct
5 research and to publish the results of those investigations. The practice of shared governance that
6 structures institutional decision-making depends on the right of a member of the faculty, or an
7 academic staff member directly engaged in teaching or research, to address any matter of
8 institutional policy or action, whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional
9 governance, without fear of retaliation. This right is a core aspect of academic freedom.

- 10 [a.] b. It is the policy of the University to maintain and encourage full freedom within the law of inquiry,
11 discourse, teaching, research, and publication and to protect any member of the academic staff
12 against influences, from within or without the University, which would restrict the member's
13 exercise of these freedoms in the member's area of scholarly interest, as well as to maintain full
14 freedom of discourse regarding University policies and actions whether or not uttered as a
15 member of an agency of institutional governance. The right to the protection of the University
16 shall not, however, include any right to the services of the university counsel or the counsel's
17 assistants in any governmental or judicial proceedings in which the academic freedom of the staff
18 member may be in issue.
- 19 [b.] c. ~~As a citizen, a faculty member may exercise the same freedoms as other citizens without~~
20 ~~institutional censorship or discipline.~~ Members of the faculty, and academic staff members who
21 are directly engaged in teaching or research, have the freedoms identified in Article X, Section
22 2.a above and have the freedom to speak to any matter of social, political, economic, or other
23 interest to the larger community. International members of the faculty, and academic staff shall
24 enjoy these same freedoms. ~~A faculty member should be mindful, however, that accuracy,~~
25 ~~forthrightness, and dignity befit association with the University and a person of learning and that~~
26 ~~the public may judge that person's profession and the University by the individual's conduct and~~
27 ~~utterances.~~
- 28 [c.] d. All the rights enumerated in sections X.2. a, b and c above are subject to the applicable standards
29 of academic conduct. Further, a member of the faculty, and any academic staff member, should
30 be mindful that accuracy, forthrightness, and dignity befit association with the University and a
31 person of learning and that the public may judge that person's profession and the University by
32 the individual's conduct and utterances. If, in the president's judgment, a ~~faculty member of the~~
33 ~~faculty or academic staff who is directly engaged in teaching or research ; exercises freedom of~~
34 ~~expression as a citizen and fails to heed the these admonitions of Article X, Section 2[b],~~ the
35 president may publicly disassociate the Board of Trustees and the University from and express
36 their disapproval of such objectionable expressions.
- 37 [d.] e. A staff member of the faculty, or an academic staff member directly engaged in teaching or
38 research, who believes that he or she does not enjoy the academic freedom which it is the policy
39 of the University to maintain and encourage shall be entitled to a hearing on written request
40 before the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the appropriate campus senate. Such
41 hearing shall be conducted in accordance with established rules of procedure. The committee
42 shall make findings of facts and recommendations to the president and, at its discretion, may
43 make an appropriate report to the senate. The several committees may from time to time
44 establish their own rules of procedure.

UNIVERSITY STATUTES AND SENATE PROCEDURES

William Maher, Chair

H. George Friedman

Scott Jacobs

Calvin Lear

Anna-Maria Marshall

Mark Roszkowski

Cheyenne Wu

Sandy Jones, *Ex officio (designee)*

Jenny Roether, *Ex officio*

Dedra Williams, *Observer*

**SP.15.07, Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article X, Section 2 – Academic Freedom
Appendix A**

STATUTES – CURRENT

SP.10.11 – Approved by the Senate 12/6/2010

USC ST-72 – Approved by USC 3/18/14

ARTICLE X, SECTION 2

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE *STATUTES*, ARTICLE X, SECTION 2

**PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE *STATUTES*, ARTICLE X,
SECTION 2**

Section 2. Academic Freedom

Section 2. Academic Freedom

Section 2. Academic Freedom

a. Academic freedom is the freedom to teach, both in and outside the classroom, to conduct research and to publish the results of those investigations, and to address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance. Academic staff members have the freedom to speak to any matter of social, political, economic, or other interest to the larger community, subject to the applicable academic standards of conduct.

a. Academic freedom includes the freedom to teach, both in and outside the classroom, to conduct research and to publish the results of those investigations. The practice of shared governance that structures institutional decision-making depends on the right of a member of the faculty, or an academic staff member directly engaged in teaching or research, to address any matter of institutional policy or action, whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance, without fear of retaliation. This right is a core aspect of academic freedom.

a. It is the policy of the University to maintain and encourage full freedom within the law of inquiry, discourse, teaching, research, and publication and to protect any member of the academic staff against influences, from within or without the University, which would restrict the member's exercise of these freedoms in the member's area of scholarly interest. The right to the protection of the University shall not, however, include any right to the services of the university counsel or the counsel's assistants in any governmental or

[a.] b. It is the policy of the University to maintain and encourage full freedom within the law of inquiry, discourse, teaching, research, and publication and to protect any member of the academic staff against influences, from within or without the University, which would restrict the member's exercise of these freedoms in the member's area of scholarly interest, as well as to maintain full freedom of discourse regarding University policies and actions whether or not uttered as a member of an agency of institutional governance. The right to the protection of the University shall not, however, include any right to the services of

[a.] b. It is the policy of the University to maintain and encourage full freedom within the law of inquiry, discourse, teaching, research, and publication and to protect any member of the academic staff against influences, from within or without the University, which would restrict the member's exercise of these freedoms in the member's area of scholarly interest, as well as to maintain full freedom of discourse regarding University policies and actions whether or not uttered as a member of an agency of institutional governance. The right to the protection of the University shall not, however, include

judicial proceedings in which the academic freedom of the staff member may be in issue.

the university counsel or the counsel's assistants in any governmental or judicial proceedings in which the academic freedom of the staff member may be in issue.

any right to the services of the university counsel or the counsel's assistants in any governmental or judicial proceedings in which the academic freedom of the staff member may be an issue.

b. As a citizen, a faculty member may exercise the same freedoms as other citizens without institutional censorship or discipline. A faculty member should be mindful, however, that accuracy, forthrightness, and dignity befit association with the University and a person of learning and that the public may judge that person's profession and the University by the individual's conduct and utterances.

[b.] c. As a citizen, an [faculty] academic staff member may exercise the same freedoms as other citizens without institutional censorship or discipline. International members of the academic staff shall enjoy these same freedoms. An [faculty] academic staff member should be mindful, however, that accuracy, forthrightness, and dignity befit association with the University and a person of learning and that the public may judge that person's profession and the University by the individual's conduct and utterances.

[b.] c. [As a citizen, a faculty member may exercise the same freedoms as other citizens without institutional censorship or discipline.]Members of the faculty, and academic staff members who are directly engaged in teaching or research, have the freedoms identified in Article X, Section 2.a above and have the freedom to speak to any matter of social, political, economic, or other interest to the larger community. International members of the faculty, and academic staff shall enjoy these same freedoms. [A faculty member should be mindful, however, that accuracy, forthrightness, and dignity befit association with the University and a person of learning and that the public may judge that person's profession and the University by the individual's conduct and utterances.]

c. If, in the president's judgment, a faculty member exercises freedom of expression as a citizen and fails to heed the admonitions of Article X, Section 2b, the president may publicly disassociate the Board of Trustees and the University from and express their disapproval of such objectionable expressions.

[c.] d. If, in the president's judgment, an [faculty] academic staff member exercises freedom of expression as a citizen and fails to heed the admonitions of Article X, Section 2[b]c, the president may publicly disassociate the Board of Trustees and the University from and express their disapproval of such objectionable expressions.

[c.] d. All the rights enumerated in sections X.2. a, b and c above are subject to the applicable standards of academic conduct. Further, a member of the faculty, and any academic staff member, should be mindful that accuracy, forthrightness, and dignity befit association with the University and a person of learning and that the public may judge that person's profession and the University by the individual's conduct and utterances.

If, in the president's judgment, a [faculty] member of the faculty, or academic staff who is directly engaged in teaching or research [, exercises freedom of expression as a citizen and] fails to heed these admonitions of ~~Article X, Section 2[b]~~, the president may publicly disassociate the Board of Trustees and the University from and express their disapproval of such objectionable expressions.

d. A staff member who believes that he or she does not enjoy the academic freedom which it is the policy of the University to maintain and encourage shall be entitled to a hearing on written request before the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the appropriate campus senate. Such hearing shall be conducted in accordance with established rules of procedure. The committee shall make findings of facts and recommendations to the president and, at its discretion, may make an appropriate report to the senate. The several committees may from time to time establish their own rules of procedure.

[d.] e. An academic staff member who believes that he or she does not enjoy the academic freedom which it is the policy of the University to maintain and encourage shall be entitled to a hearing on written request before the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the appropriate campus senate. Such hearing shall be conducted in accordance with established rules of procedure. The committee shall make findings of facts and recommendations to the president and, at its discretion, may make an appropriate report to the senate. The several committees may from time to time establish their own rules of procedure.

[d.] e. A [staff] member of the faculty, or an academic staff member directly engaged in teaching or research, who believes that he or she does not enjoy the academic freedom which it is the policy of the University to maintain and encourage shall be entitled to a hearing on written request before the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the appropriate campus senate. Such hearing shall be conducted in accordance with established rules of procedure. The committee shall make findings of facts and recommendations to the president and, at its discretion, may make an appropriate report to the senate. The several committees may from time to time establish their own rules of procedure.

SP.15.07, Revisions to the Statutes, Article X, Section 2 – Academic Freedom
Appendix B: Background Statement from SP.10.11, provided to the
Senate when revision was first adopted, December 6, 2010

SP.10.11 Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article X, Section 2 – Academic Freedom

BACKGROUND

The principles of academic freedom are intended to prevent the disciplining of a member of the academic staff whose teaching, research, or publications might be controversial or unpopular. Although these freedoms are core values in universities, they enjoy little formal legal protection. In the United States, academic freedom is largely protected through University policies. At the University of Illinois, Article X, Section 2 of the *University Statutes* both defines and secures academic freedom.

According to a recent report prepared by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), several recent decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court and lower courts have raised questions about the limits of academic freedom for faculty and academic staff at public universities.¹ In these cases, the courts have limited the rights of public employees who criticize their employers. In *Garcetti v. Ceballos*, the Supreme Court allowed the Los Angeles district attorney’s office to discipline an assistant district attorney who had publicly criticized the way the office was being run. The Supreme Court stated, in relevant part, that when public employees speak “pursuant to their official duties, the employees are not speaking as citizens for First Amendment purposes, and the Constitution does not insulate their communications from employer discipline.”

In *Garcetti*, the Supreme Court did not address the question of faculty speech in public universities and colleges, and it explicitly recognized that academic freedom could pose a separate set of questions. Nevertheless, lower federal courts have applied the *Garcetti* rule to faculty at public universities and upheld discipline of faculty members. For example, Juan Hong, a tenured professor of civil engineering at the University of California, Irvine criticized his college’s hiring and promotion practices as violating university governance standards. He later sued when he was denied a merit raise, allegedly based on his statements. The trial court ruled that his statements were made in the course of his “official duties.” The court explained: “[A] faculty member’s official duties are not limited to classroom instruction and professional research. [His] professional responsibilities . . . a wide range of academic, administrative, and personnel functions in accordance with UCI’s self governance principle.” The court also held that the university “is entitled to unfettered discretion when it restricts statements an employee makes on the job and according to his professional responsibilities.” The trial court’s decision is currently being appealed in the Ninth Circuit federal appeals court.

The trial court’s decision in *Hong* – and other similar judicial decisions around the country – raises serious concerns about the scope of academic freedom at public universities. In particular, these decisions seem to limit the right of faculty who criticize the administration in the course of performing their duties of institutional governance. Thus, the AAUP recommends that academic institutions clarify their policies to include faculty governance within the scope of academic freedom.

Because this judicial trend narrows the freedom of academics to participate in governance of their institutions and civic discourse in general, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure has proposed that the language of Article X, Section 2 of the *University Statutes* be strengthened to more specifically define the scope of academic freedom and to affirm the freedom of the University of Illinois’ academic staff to teach, conduct research, and participate in faculty governance and civic discourse without interference. The proposed changes to Section 2 also clarify that academic freedom is a right of all university staff who are engaged in teaching and research, including those who are not U.S. citizens.

¹ American Association of University Professors (2009). “Protecting an Independent Faculty Voice: Academic Freedom After *Garcetti v. Ceballos*.” <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/A/postgarcettireport.htm> (accessed July 7, 2010)

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

Faculty Advisory Council to the Board of Higher Education
(Final; Information)

HE.15.02 Report on the October 17, 2014 meeting of the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE.

The [Faculty Advisory Council \(FAC\)](#) of the [Illinois Board of Higher Education \(IBHE\)](#) held a regularly scheduled meeting at Governors State University (GSU) with 30 members present.

The meeting opened at 9:00 AM with introductions of those present. GSU Provost Dr. Deborah Bordelon welcomed the group to her campus. She spoke about the university's history and remarked that this year for the first time GSU has accepted 242 freshmen to its campus. In addition, this year GSU opened Prairie Place, a new residence facility on campus. Three faculty fellows, selected through a competition, live in this facility and interact with students. This has been a very successful experience thus far.

Professor Robert Bionaz, a member of the Chicago State University's (CSU) Senate Executive Committee explained the recent friction between the faculty and certain administrators and the subsequent decision by the Chicago State's Board of Trustees to dissolve their senate.

GSU President Dr. Elaine Maimon welcomed the Council to her campus. She noted that she is an English professor and still considers herself a faculty member at heart. Her goal is to educate students to become independent writers and thinkers. She also commented that GSU has established a strategic planning and budgeting council. A hallmark of this effort is shared governance and transparency. GSU has a very good relationship with the area community colleges. Dr. Maimon explained that GSU is committed to not recruiting students away from attending community colleges as freshmen. She explained that community colleges were supportive of GSU's application to the Illinois Board of Higher Education to begin accepting freshmen students.

Ocheng Jany, a retiring member of the IBHE Academic Staff was recognized for his years of contributions to IBHE, FAC and higher education.

The three caucuses of the Council (four year public universities; community colleges and private/independent institutions) met separately and reported back to the Council later in the day. Subjects discussed by the caucuses included MAP funding; situation at CSU; continuity of leadership in our faculty governance bodies; reduced funding for student counseling and the absence of mental health professionals on campuses (especially for veterans); the impact of requiring a baccalaureate degree for nursing; and maintaining quality of education with declining funding.

The minutes of the September 19, 2014 FAC meeting were approved. The meeting adjourned at 2:15 PM. The next FAC meeting is scheduled for December 12, 2014 in Springfield and will be hosted by the IBHE staff.

This report is prepared based on the draft minutes of the FAC meeting minutes prepared by the FAC Secretary, Professor Steve Rock of WIU. Much credit is owed to him.

Respectfully submitted
Abbas Aminmansour

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE
University Senates Conference
(Final; Information)

UC.15.04 Report on the October 8, 2014 Meeting of the University Senates Conference at the Chicago Campus

The Conference membership list for 2014-15 can be found here:

<http://www.usc.uillinois.edu/membership.cfm>

The agenda for this meeting can be found here:

<http://www.usc.uillinois.edu/sites/usc.uillinois.edu/files/documents/AGN-1008.14.pdf>

The Conference was joined by President Robert Easter, Vice-President of Academic Affairs Christophe Pierre, and Secretary of the Board of Trustees Susan Kies.

The meeting was called to order at 10:20 AM.

Comments of the USC Chair: Chair Chambers ceded the floor to Nicholas Burbules, Chair of the Conference's Statutes and Governance Committee, who provided an update on the planned consultation process on the general revision of the University *Statutes* and *General Rules*.

Prof. Burbules reported that on October 6, 2014, Conference had received the Board of Trustees' response to our comments on proposed revisions, and that in some cases, previous recommendations had been withdrawn; in other cases, very minor changes had been made to the proposed wording sent by the Conference. In the October 6 communication, the Board's Governance, Personnel, and Ethics Committee charged the Conference to forward the proposed revisions to the senates and requested that the Senates forward their advice to the Conference for final transmittal to the Board by February 26, 2015. The Statutes charge the Conference with reconciling any differences in the advice of the three senates before forwarding the Senates' and the Conference's advice to the Board. Prof. Burbules reminded the Conference that, with the exception of proposed revisions to the section on Intellectual Property, only the Conference—not each senate—is required to give its advice on proposed revisions to the *General Rules*.

Chair Chambers thanked Prof. Burbules for his hard work, and commented that the Conference's efficiency and conscientiousness had increased our credibility with the Board of Trustees.

Meeting with Dr. Susan Kies, Secretary of the Board of Trustees

Dr. Kies expressed her appreciation for this opportunity to meet with the Conference, and emphasized that the members of this Board are very interested in understanding the wants and needs of the faculty.

Dr. Kies spoke with USC about her duties, which she assumed three years ago, after having served as associate dean of the UIC College of Medicine on the Urbana campus. Among many other duties, Dr. Kies provides support to all the BOT committees, as well as to the presidential search committee.

One of her accomplishments so far has been the replacement of the voluminous paper documentation for Board meetings (called the Board Book) by a BOT digital portal. Every week, Dr. Kies sends a dispatch to the Board members, and each trustee now uses an iPad to access materials. Dr. Kies estimated that this change saved the University about \$15-20,000 per year.

Dr. Kies has also updated the use of technology in the BOT office, moving from paper to electronic records.

After a discussion with Dr. Kies about ways to enhance the relationship between the USC and the Board, the Secretary joined Conference members for lunch.

Meeting with President Easter and Vice President Pierre

The President reported that he and Vice-President Pierre recently visited ten legislators in city and suburbs, with whom they discussed procurement relief, support for undocumented students, and general budgetary issues. An issue of continuing concern is the “sun-setting” of the current income tax increase of 5%, which will occur on December 31, 2014, unless it is re-instituted. It is likely that the University would be asked to assume more of the cost of benefits to employees if the increased income tax revenue is lost.

President Easter and Vice-President Pierre expressed concern about whether the University can sustain current enrollments, especially at the undergraduate level, given our high tuition—in spite of the fact that we have more applications now than ever. The Conference discussed with the President and the Vice-President our shared concern that not enough financial aid is available for students from working-class families.

President Easter emphasized that we must remain competitive with our peers in terms of salary, and we also must be conscious of how we create the resources to pay our bills. He shared the good news that salaries for humanities faculty on the Urbana campus now are at peer levels.

In a discussion with Conference members about salary programs, Vice-President Pierre clarified that core salary increases for employees who work for University Administration (that is, the Administration of the University as a whole rather than one of the campuses) have to come from campuses. The President and the Vice-President praised the work of the UA-level **Budget Review Advisory Committee**, which includes faculty, UA administrators, and campus administrator chairs. The President reiterated a view he had expressed repeatedly: University Administration exists to provide service for the core academic functions, and those being served should have input into whether the services are working well.

Business Meeting

The Conference voted to forward all the proposed revisions to the Statutes to the three senates, and to request that they return their advice by February 20, 2015.

Chair Chambers announced that he would be giving a presentation at the October 30 meeting of the Board’s Governance, Personnel, and Ethics Committee on this year’s goals of Conference, which include drafting of a USC white paper to deal in part with how we see our role in shared governance. He asked all USC subcommittee chairs to share the committees’ respective goals in time for incorporation in that presentation.

Prof. Jorge Villegas reported that the Task Force on Open Access will be sending a draft policy to the senates for their advice. (The Task Force was appointed by the Board of Trustees in response to the passage in 2013 of the Open Access to Research Articles Act. The Act requires that each public university develop a policy on open access to the research articles published by its faculty members.

The Conference discussed the report from the Council of Illinois University Senates on the recent aggressive actions by the Merit Board to question the legitimacy of the classification of Academic Professional positions and to reclassify them as Civil Service positions. Given the crucial role played by Academic Professionals on all three campuses, the Conference decided to write a letter to the members of our Board of Trustees encouraging them to continue their efforts, as representatives to the Merit Board, to preserve the right of the campuses to classify academic positions in accordance with their informed judgment.

Prof. Jorge Villegas, Chair of the USC Hospital and Health Affairs Committee, reported that a third report is now being written on the projected plans for an independently-accredited College of Medicine in Urbana. The Huron Group has been commissioned to provide this report. The USC Health Affairs Committee has also seen a report written by Arthur Rubenstein on the issue. Prof. Villegas offered to share all materials with the Conference.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Joyce Tolliver, USC Liaison to the Senate

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE
Senate Executive Committee
(Final; Information)

SC.15.05 New Provost Communications #26 and #27

Communication #26:

Promotion to Teaching, Research or Clinical Associate or Full Professor Titles
Appendices 1-8

Communication #27:

Shared Governance for Academic Units

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Roy Campbell, Chair
Melissa Madsen
Kim Graber, Vice-Chair
William Maher
Abbas Aminmansour
Mary Mallory
Nicholas Burbules
Gay Miller
John Hart
David O'Brien
Matthew Hill
Michael Sandretto
Prasanta Kalita
Kevin Seymour
Calvin Lear
Joyce Tolliver

PROMOTION TO TEACHING, RESEARCH OR CLINICAL ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR TITLES

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
COMMUNICATION NO. # 26

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW	2
GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION.....	3
CRITERIA	4
TEACHING ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS AND TEACHING PROFESSORS.....	4
RESEARCH ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS AND RESEARCH PROFESSORS.....	5
CLINICAL ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS AND CLINICAL PROFESSORS	5
EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE’S PERFORMANCE AND POTENTIAL CANDIDATE’S AND DEPARTMENT HEAD’S ROLES	6
ROLE AND COMPOSITION OF PROMOTION COMMITTEES	6
CONFIDENTIALITY.....	7
EVALUATION OF TEACHING	8
EVALUATION OF RESEARCH.....	9
EVALUATION OF SERVICE.....	10
OUTSIDE EVALUATION OF RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, TEACHING, SERVICE, PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY	10
APPEAL OF PROMOTION DENIALS	11
INITIAL APPOINTMENTS AT THE ASSOCIATE OR FULL LEVEL	12
ASSISTANCE	12
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING PROMOTION PAPERS	13
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS	13
COVER SHEET.....	14
INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE OUTLINE.....	15
I. PERSONAL HISTORY AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	15
II. PUBLICATIONS AND CREATIVE WORKS.....	16
III. RESIDENT INSTRUCTION.....	17
IV. SERVICE.....	20
V. RESEARCH	21
VI. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS	22
VII. SPECIAL COMMENTS BY THE UNIT EXECUTIVE OFFICER	24
VIII. SPECIAL COMMENTS BY THE DEAN	24
ASSISTANCE	24
ATTACHMENTS.....	24
• CHECKLIST FOR TRANSMITTAL OF RECOMMENDATION.....	24
• RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION (COVER SHEET AND OUTLINE).....	24
• SAMPLE LETTERS TO EXTERNAL EVALUATOR	24

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE OR FULL TEACHING,
RESEARCH OR CLINICAL PROFESSOR TITLES
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
COMMUNICATION NO. # 26

Overview

Promotional paths for specialized faculty provide opportunities for the development of long-term careers at Illinois and ensure that these valuable employees can contribute to the exceptional quality of teaching and research that is required on campus. Although these promotions do not include tenure, departments are encouraged to provide multi-year contracts with appointments to the ranks of associate and full teaching, research and clinical professors. Given that these appointments carry with them the title of *professor*, the University uses a rigorous multi-stage process of review that involves external evaluation for promotion of specialized faculty in these tracks. Each year, academic units determine which specialized faculty members should be considered for promotion. Departments and colleges should be selective in their recommendations to promote faculty. Annual review meetings are an appropriate time to discuss whether and/or when a promotional review should occur.

A promotion dossier, including letters and the cover sheet with votes, is required for specialized faculty members to be promoted to the associate or full rank. Each department must develop written criteria and procedures for specialized faculty promotions. In developing departmental promotion policies and procedures, departments should consult with their colleges to ensure coordination and conformance to college-level policies. As dictated by department and college procedures, departments shall develop a recommendation regarding the candidate's promotion. For the recommendation to advance, the executive officer must endorse the recommendation and submit documentation supporting and explaining the recommendation. Each recommendation for promotion is reviewed at multiple levels, including the home unit and at each successive unit in the reporting chain up through the campus level. Faculty committees should review and make recommendations regarding promotions at each administrative level, but how faculty committees are constituted is left to the discretion of the unit and should be outlined in the unit bylaws, policies and procedural documents. Those governing unit documents should set the unit schedule for preparation and review of promotions. Units should consider involving specialized faculty in the review process but, as noted in Provost Communication No. 25, it is important to ensure that significant tenure system faculty involvement occurs in promotion reviews of specialized faculty. Specialized faculty promotion cases are administratively reviewed by the Provost's Office to ensure that the criteria and standards for promotions of the unit, college and campus have been met.

The expectations of excellence implicit in the procedures laid out in this document also apply to initial appointments to the senior ranks of associate and full teaching, research, and clinical professorial appointments at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Units can develop

an expedited process to review an individual's credentials and qualifications for an initial appointment in a modified professorial title at the associate or full level. More information about expedited reviews is provided below in the section entitled **Initial Appointments at the Associate or Full Level**.

Promotion committees above the level of an individual's unit judge how well the case has been made for granting of the promotion. In general, they do not evaluate the specific work itself; this is done by the external referees and by the faculty of the appointing unit. 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.

General Guidelines for Promotion

Each of the three specialized faculty professorial tracks has criteria and expectations that are specific to the specialized focus of those appointments. Promotion from the assistant to the associate rank within all three of these appointment tracks, however, requires that the individual has accomplishments that show real promise of making an impact both within the unit and beyond, either through scholarly publications, invited talks, externally funded research, or other related activities involving their discipline, pedagogy and student interactions. A recommendation for promotion, either to the associate or full level, should be based upon an assessment that the candidate has made contributions of an appropriate magnitude and quality in the specialized area(s) of teaching, research, or clinical instruction that are required of the specific appointment and consistent with the rank. This assessment must be supported by tangible, demonstrable evidence. The recommendation package should include a statement by the unit executive officer indicating succinctly why the department and campus will be strengthened and why the best interests of the university will be served by the promotion.

A recommendation for promotion to the rank of full teaching, research, or clinical professor should be based upon an assessment that, since the last promotion, the candidate has made contributions of appropriate magnitude, independence and quality in teaching and/or research 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 primary missions of the University are teaching, research, and service and public engagement. In the promotion review of specialized faculty, particular consideration should be given to the performance of the individual in the main area of the candidate's job duties as set forth in the appointment paperwork and job description. Because of the specialized nature of each appointment it is essential that a statement of the candidate's job duties and expectations, including percentage of effort expected for teaching, research and service, at the time of appointment (and at any subsequent time if changed during the period under review), be provided to the internal committees reviewing the promotion request and to external reviewers. Please note that it is expected that the appointments in the teaching professor track and clinical professor track will have at least 50% of effort assigned to teaching. Similarly, appointments in research professor track are expected to have at least 50% of effort assigned to research. Nevertheless,

appropriate consideration also should be given to contributions made across the other university missions, as dictated by the structure of the candidate's appointment and job duties. Explicit criteria for judging the quality of performance must be developed by the candidate's department at the time of appointment, and there should be ample evidence that these criteria are being met in an exemplary fashion.

The word "research" is interpreted throughout this document to include not only research and scholarship as narrowly understood, but also creative artistry and research that is interdisciplinary and/or translational. The terms "research," "scholarship," "scholarly achievement," and "creative work" are used essentially interchangeably here to denote this broader range of activity.

Criteria

The promotion of specialized faculty members to teaching, research and clinical associate or full professors is a selective process that involves significant rigor, including the creation of a dossier with letters of support from inside and outside the unit. The promotion criteria will differ based on the specialized focus of the appointment (i.e., teaching, research, or clinical tracks. Decisions about whether to promote a specialized faculty member ultimately rests in the guidelines established in the departments. Typically, it will require a number of years, roughly five or six years, for individuals to build a record that establishes that the criteria for promotion have been met. It is expected that, in the normal course, the time interval from the initial time of appointment to the first promotion and from the first promotion to the next would entail an equal amount of time and effort. It is important to note that although the expectation is that specialized faculty members will be given a number of years to build a record towards promotion, units should annually evaluate job performance and can make a decision to not reappoint a specialized faculty member for either performance or budgetary reasons at any time. Units must be careful not to make promises or guarantees of continued employment that are inconsistent with the non-tenured status of specialized faculty members.

Teaching Associate Professors and Teaching Professors

Promotion to teaching associate professor and teaching professor is based on the impact and maturity of the individual's record of teaching, classroom innovation, student interactions, and scholarly accomplishments in pedagogy. At a minimum, a candidate for a teaching associate professor position should be able to demonstrate instructional contributions to the college, campus, and broader discipline, or, if this is to be the person's first appointment on campus, have a proven record of making such contributions. Teaching professors (assistant, associate, and full) are required to hold a Ph.D or equivalent highest degree and expertise in the relevant discipline.

Promotion to the rank of full teaching professor should be based on a fulfilled promise of quality teaching and pedagogy, including making advancements in teaching and learning in the discipline that led to innovative strategies and marked course improvement. At this level, a teaching professor should be making broader contributions to pedagogy, often by sharing creative and scholarly work at conferences and in publications. Broader pedagogical contributions could also be shown by such accomplishments as publishing textbooks in reputable presses, securing competitive internal and external grants to develop curriculum or pedagogy, and effective

mentoring of instructors, lecturers and graduate assistants. Units should develop appropriate discipline-specific criteria of success. Note that an individual *may* also be contributing to scholarship in his or her specific discipline or field, although this is not a campus-level requirement of the title. A teaching professor *may* also be involved in department, college or university service. The expectations for research and service should be clearly articulated by the department at the time of appointment and the evaluation of the candidate's activities is governed by those express expectations.

Research Associate Professors and Research Professors

Promotion to research associate professor and research professor is based primarily on the impact and maturity of the individual's scholarship. At a minimum, appointment to a research associate professor title requires that the individual has demonstrated the ability to make a substantial impact in a research area, as shown by publications, invited talks, external funding and other related activities. Research assistant professor appointments initially may be funded either entirely or partially from existing grants for which principal investigators need assistance in conducting and/or managing the research. Over time, these individuals are expected to develop independent research agendas and, typically, secure some external funding for their work. Research professors (assistant, associate, and full) are required to hold a Ph.D. or equivalent highest degree and expertise in the relevant discipline.

Promotion to the rank of research professor should be based on a fulfilled promise of quality research, including making discoveries that lead to grant funding and publications in leading peer-reviewed journals or publications. At this level, a research professor *may* also be contributing to the teaching and mentoring students, but this is not a campus-level requirement of the title. A research professor *may* also be involved in department, college or university service. The expectations for teaching and service should be clearly articulated by the department at the time of appointment and the evaluation of the candidate's activities is governed by those express expectations.

Clinical Associate Professors and Clinical Professors

Clinical professorial appointments are the specialized faculty appointments that are most heavily determined by the academic department's discipline and related professional field. Each department must evaluate and determine the appropriate role, if any, of clinical professorial appointments in their unit. Traditionally, clinical faculty are most often found in medical areas, such as the College of Medicine and College of Veterinary Medicine as well as the College of Applied Health Sciences and the College of Social Work. Additionally, clinical faculty are also found in the College of Law. Clinical faculty are primarily engaged in providing instruction and do so from the perspective of a practitioner, either within a traditional classroom setting or a lab or other applied learning environment. Because clinical professorial appointments are so closely aligned with specific disciplines, the criteria for these appointments must be carefully developed and communicated at the departmental level. Each department must evaluate and determine minimum criteria within their units that are appropriate to warrant a clinical professorial appointment at each rank of assistant, associate and full.

In general, promotion to associate clinical professor and clinical professor is based on the level of education, degree obtained, years of experience in the relevant field, areas of expertise, and specialized knowledge necessary to fill curricular needs. A recommendation for promotion to clinical

associate professor or clinical professor should have supporting evidence that the candidate has met the criteria laid out in the departmental promotional policy. At a minimum, promotion to a clinical associate professor must be based upon an assessment that the candidate has made contributions of an appropriate magnitude and quality in the discipline and in the teaching and learning in the unit and campus, demonstrating a high likelihood of sustaining contributions to both. Note that an individual *may* also be contributing to scholarship in his or her specific discipline or field, although this is not a campus-level requirement of the title. A clinical professor *may* also be involved in department, college or university service. The expectations for research and service should be clearly articulated by the department at the time of appointment and the evaluation of the candidate's activities is governed by those express expectations.

Promotion to the rank of clinical professor should be based upon promise fulfilled. The case for such a promotion should include evidence of appropriate accomplishments in the relevant field and with respect to teaching in the department, college and campus, as identified in the departmental promotional policy. A recommendation for promotion to the rank of full should be based upon an assessment that, since the last promotion, the candidate has made contributions of appropriate magnitude and quality in teaching and has demonstrated the ability to sustain contributions to the field.

Evaluation of the Candidate's Performance and Potential Candidate's and Department Head's Roles

A candidate for promotion should never prepare departmental evaluative materials in support of his or her promotion recommendation. This is the responsibility of the department head or chair, or his or her designee. The department should identify the evaluator for each section. Department policy and procedures should address whether evaluators can include specialized faculty members. In all cases, evaluators must be at or above the rank of the promotion being sought. The candidate may prepare descriptive material for the dossier, but it must be reviewed and checked carefully by the department head/chair or his or her designee (as determined by departmental policy). Normally, it is best to have the candidate submit descriptive material and the department head/chair or designee prepare the evaluative information in the required format.

When a case has raised significant questions, it is imperative that the department head or chair provide commentary when forwarding that case for subsequent review at higher levels. For instance, commentary should be provided when questions were raised in the department review of the case, when concerns were raised by the external evaluators and/or when a case received a split vote. This commentary should explain the merits of the case and address forthrightly its strengths and weaknesses.

Role and Composition of Promotion Committees

A faculty committee approves promotion materials and moves the candidates for promotion forward at each administrative level. The specific procedures for selecting the members of department and college specialized faculty promotion committees must be set in department and college bylaws. The procedures must ensure that tenure system faculty have a significant role in

the promotion process, that promotion evaluations are independent across levels (e.g., someone who votes on a case at the department level cannot review a case at the college level), and that conflicts of interest are eliminated.

Confidentiality

The Illinois Personnel Record Review Act allows specialized faculty to inspect internal evaluation documentation used for promotion 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 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 promotion 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 promotion vote taken by the candidate's unit committee. When such 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 written departmental evaluations or 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 promotion 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:

1. Qualifications of External Evaluators
2. External Review Letters
3. Internal Letters of Reference (solicited according to the guidelines in the following paragraph):

In the context of a promotion 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.

4. Any direct quotes or attributions to either external or internal review letters contained in the Department Evaluations (research, teaching and service) and in the Special Comments by the Unit Executive Officer.

Evaluation of Teaching

When instruction is part of an individual's title and/or appointment, promotion recommendations must include a thorough evaluation of the candidate's teaching. Although 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.

Teaching evaluation **must** include a personal statement of teaching philosophy and record, a list of courses taught, a representative sample of syllabi and course materials (e.g., exams, assignments, quizzes), new course proposals, innovative instructional tools, and 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, but 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. This method is valuable for it entails considerable communication among faculty being evaluated and their colleagues involved in the evaluation. The campus is encouraging more extensive use of this approach, not only in the period when a promotion is being considered, but over the entire period of a faculty member's career at Illinois. When a candidate's teaching or curricular contributions have achieved recognition by peers beyond the campus, the ability to comment on the instructional contributions of the candidate should be considered in the selection of external evaluators.

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, and this can be a valuable part of an evaluation. 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 of the views. If information in this category is to be developed, it should be based on a method that can give a legitimate sample of views.

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 in a sequence, evaluation of student work products such as exams, papers, artwork, performances, and so on.

Generally, it has not proven useful to provide selected students comments from ICES forms for essentially the same reason that anecdotal comments from other quarters 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 candidate must provide (in three pages or less) 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 can be very beneficial to evaluators 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 department is encouraged to ask the candidate to develop the statement at an early stage in the evaluation, so that it can be shared with peer observers and external evaluators. If the recommendation is for promotion to teaching associate professor, the statement should focus on teaching carried out since initial appointment as assistant professor. (The statement may include work at another institution.) For recommended promotion from teaching associate professor to the rank of teaching professor, the statement should focus on teaching accomplishments since the last promotion.

Evaluation of Research

When research is part of an individual's title and appointment, a review of the candidate's scholarly portfolio and performance should be conducted. A review of a candidate's research must include the candidate's statement of research goals and accomplishments (in three pages or less), the departmental evaluation of research accomplishments -- emphasizing the two most important publications or creative works -- and the departmental evaluation of future potential.

If the recommendation is for promotion to research associate professor, the statement should focus on research carried out since initial appointment as assistant professor. (The statement may include work as a research assistant professor at another institution.) For recommended promotion from research associate professor to the rank of research 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.

This statement can be very beneficial to evaluators 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 department is encouraged to ask the candidate to develop the statement at an early stage in the evaluation, so that it can be shared with external evaluators.

The departmental evaluation of research accomplishments should indeed 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, and the impact on the field.

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 direct supervisors such as 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. Please note that evaluation letters provided by individuals who are part of our campus community are supplemental letters, *in addition to* the required three external evaluation letters.

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.

Evaluation of Service

Service encompasses public engagement activities, professional/ disciplinary service and university service. Explicit expectations for service shall be stated at the time of the candidate's appointment and shall govern the candidate's promotion review. If a faculty member has contributed to the department, college, university, discipline, or public, he or she should include a description of such service in the promotional documentation.

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

Letters from at least three 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. They must be:

- sufficient in number,
- from appropriately selected individuals at **comparable institutions**,

(NOTE: Units must keep in mind that the important thing is that evaluators have the proper credentials and experience, as well as information about the campus, college and departmental expectations for the promotion being sought, to provide

an appropriate evaluation. Wherever possible, evaluations letters should be sought from the university's peers. 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 three letters from evaluators at academic institutions.)

- from individuals of **appropriate rank (e.g., tenured professors and specialized faculty of a more senior rank)**,
- from **objective evaluators** without conflicts of interest. For example, letters for promotion should not be solicited from the individual's thesis advisor or current or past collaborators.
- Date-stamped upon receipt

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.

In regard to the selection of external reviewers, the procedures to solicit letters, and the required elements of the letters, see Communication No. 9. A candidate does not need to have established a national reputation; rather, external reviewers are asked to review the dossier in light of the campus and departmental expectations for the respective titles and the specific job duties of the candidate. **It is extremely important that letters soliciting external reviews of specialized faculty explain the standards for promotion at our institution and define the role of specialized faculty as an appointment that is focused on a particular area: teaching, research, or clinical.** An external evaluator may not be familiar with the specialized faculty appointments at Illinois. 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. Because specialized faculty appointments are unique to the campus, please include a statement in the letter to external evaluators that describes the nature of the candidate's academic activities and the departmental and campus expectations for those activities. Letters to referees should indicate that the candidate's promotion does not include "indefinite tenure."

In addition to the external reviews, departments may choose to solicit **additional** letters from outside the department but internal to the University. 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. Internal review letters, however, are in addition to the required minimum of three external letters.

Appeal of Promotion Denials

In the event of a negative decision for promotion, candidates for promotion should be afforded an opportunity to appeal the decision at the level it was made and an opportunity for a second-level review of procedures. 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 the department, college and campus promotion procedures. Precise steps should be followed as outlined in those procedural documents if possible, but they should not be treated as if the process is completely rigid. Specialized faculty members or their representatives often discover slight variations in procedures and thereupon claim that the entire process must be invalidated. Administrators who must certify the validity of the procedures used should approach the task with the understanding that minor deviations in the process can and must be tolerated. This is also the standard that any departmental, college or campus appeal body should adhere to in an appeal of a promotion denial.

Initial Appointments at the Associate or Full Level

If a unit wishes to offer an initial appointment in a modified professorial title at an associate or full level, an expedited process can be followed to review the individual's credentials and qualifications for the position. Specialized faculty expedited review processes for initial appointments should be developed by individual colleges, schools, and departments and should be set forth in unit promotion policies and procedures. As with the regular promotion process for specialized faculty, expedited reviews for initial appointments to a modified professorial title at an associate or full level must be reviewed by the Provost's Office to ensure that the criteria and standards for promotions of the unit, college and campus have been met.

Assistance

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

PROMOTION TO TEACHING, RESEARCH OR CLINICAL ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR TITLES

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
COMMUNICATION NO. 26

Instructions for Preparing Promotion Papers

General Instructions

1. Each recommendation for promotion is presented as follows:

Cover Sheet

Outline of Promotion Dossier

- I. Personal History and Professional Experience
- II. Publications and Creative Works
- III. Resident Instruction (to the extent applicable)
- IV. Service (Public Engagement, Professional/Disciplinary, and University) (if applicable)
- V. Research (to the extent applicable)
- VI. External Evaluations
- VII. Special Comments by the Executive Officer
- VIII. Special Comments by the Dean (only when needed)

The Cover Sheet can be found in the attachments to this Communication.

2. 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., research for a teaching professor appointment in which no research is required or done).
3. 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. Page numbers should also be provided for any manuscript, bulletin, abstract or review noted by the candidate in the section on Publications and Creative Works. 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.*

4. Submit **one final copy with original signatures**, 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.
5. 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. 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.
6. Because specialized faculty professorial appointments can be highly individualistic, a job description or summary of the individual's job duties, and offer letter (with redactions as appropriate) must be provided for each promotion request.
7. 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.

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.
- Provide a breakdown of the effort assigned to teaching, research, and service. Please note that it is expected that appointments in the teaching and clinical professor tracks will have at least 50% effort assigned to teaching and that research professor track appointments will have at least 50% effort assigned to research.
- 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 signatures of all appropriate department heads/chairs 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.

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.

I. 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

In chronological order from past to present. For each position held, list inclusive dates, title, and location for each –University of Illinois and elsewhere.

C. Other Professional Employment

Previous and current, in chronological order as above.

D. Honors, Recognitions, and Outstanding Achievements

Fellowships, prizes, etc., in chronological order as above, that indicate stature in pedagogy, 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. Events should be listed in chronological order as above.

F. Offices Held in Professional Societies

G. Editorships/Guest Editorships of Journals or Other Learned Publications

List in chronological order from past to present

H. Grants Received

List principal investigator first, co-principal investigators, granting agency, dates of grant, and dollar amount of grant. For candidates for promotion to Professor, a full (career) list of grants may be provided or, in the interests 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.

II. Publications and Creative Works (primarily for the research professor tracks but should be included for any specialized faculty member who has 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”).*
- *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 initial 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 publications in journals.*
- *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).*
- *Reprint of papers are not required for review at the campus level.*

A. Doctoral thesis title

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

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

D. Chapters in Books, including textbooks (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. List in chronological order from past to present. 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. List in chronological order from past to present. 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. List in chronological order from past to present. Provide inclusive page numbers for book reviews.
- L. Referred Conference Papers and Presentations
- M. Other
Specify type.

III. Resident Instruction (primarily for teaching professor track and clinical professor track appointments, but should be included for any appointment with teaching responsibilities)

A. Teaching and Mentoring Record

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 immediate following this page. For each course, provide a representative sample of syllabi and course materials (exams, assignments, quizzes, etc).

2. Supervision of Graduate Students' Teaching

- List numbers of graduate students supervised.
- List supervision duties, such as training, evaluating, mentoring, writing letters of recommendation, and preparing for the job market and so on.
- List graduate students' teaching awards and ICES Scores
- List participation on 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

Specialized faculty members may make significant instructional contributions of other sorts, (e.g., through development of course materials used by other instructors, through 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. At the level of full, candidates should include evidence of broader pedagogical contributions shown by such things as authoring textbooks that are published by reputable publishers, securing competitive grants to develop curriculum or pedagogy, or successful mentoring of instructors and lecturers. Unit level policies should be consulted to identify the specific indicia of success that are appropriate for the candidate's discipline and department. Please describe noteworthy contributions made by the candidate.

Besides creating course materials for one's own class, specialized faculty may create the training materials for others to teach a course. Attach curriculum/training portfolio.

Describe ways of remaining current in the field and improving teaching through innovations using technology or new pedagogical techniques.

Explain how training and innovation activities performed fit into the department's mission.

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://cte.illinois.edu/teacheval/ices/long_prof.html). 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 has not proven useful to provide selected student comments from ICES forms, for essentially the same reason that anecdotal comments from other quarters 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](#):

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:

- *Raw data will not be accepted.*
- *Provide data for each semester and for each course under review (since last promotion).*
- *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 represent colleagues with a context for interpreting other evaluative information.

This statement should not exceed three pages.

3. Departmental Evaluation of Teaching and Course Documentation

- *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 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 serve 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, such as observation by peers, for evaluating instructional performance. 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 for this service.*

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

Specialized faculty members may have three types of service included in Section V of the dossier: public engagement, professional/disciplinary, and University/campus. Explicit expectations for service shall be stated at the time of the candidate's appointment and shall govern the candidate's promotion review.

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:

- *Contribute to the public welfare or the common good.*
- *Call upon the specialized faculty member's academic, professional, or creative expertise.*
- *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 who developed the evaluation.

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. University/ Campus Service

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

V. Research (primarily for research professor track but should be included for any specialized faculty member engaged in research)

A. Candidate's Statement of Research Goals and Accomplishments

- *The candidate must provide (in three pages or less) a statement of research goals and accomplishments, in terms of how that research supports their teaching, their pedagogical approaches, and serves the department.*
- *If teaching is the primary basis for the recommended promotion, the statement must reflect accomplishments and future plans in teaching and how they relate to the research activity.*

B. Departmental Evaluation of Research Accomplishments

- *Please provide the name of the individual who developed the evaluation.*
- *Research should be evaluated (not merely described) with emphasis on at least two publications or creative works.*
- *The evaluation should address the dimensions of quality of execution, significance of topic, and impact on the field.*

C. Departmental Evaluation of Future Potential

- *Please provide the name of the individual who developed the evaluation.*
- *Evaluate the candidate's strategy for developing his or her research beyond recent accomplishments.*
- *Assess, in realistic terms, the probable standing of the candidate in his or her field five years from now.*

VI. **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 clearly state that the promotion will not include the awarding of indefinite tenure.*
- ***Include the following required statement that explains specialized faculty appointments:***

“At the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, non-tenure system faculty position (referred to as “specialized faculty” at Illinois) included Teaching, Clinical and Research Professors (Assistant, Associate and Full). Specialized faculty members make substantial contributions to our research, teaching and service missions, but their scope of work is more specific than their tenure-system peers and the performance expectations are different. Performance expectations and promotion criteria are set forth in the individual’s job description (attached) [alternatively:”in the statement of the individual’s job duties (attached)”] and departmental and college promotion criteria [attached].

- *Include a job description and department and college promotion criteria, including percentage of effort for teaching, research and service*
- *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.*

"Our policy states that the criteria for promotion of specialized faculty at Illinois are the same regardless of length of service."

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 slightly 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 consistent with the explicit requirements regarding evaluators set forth in the department's promotional policy and procedures for specialized faculty.*
- *If the referee is familiar with the candidate's works, 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.*
- *Date-stamped upon receipt.*

VII. Special Comments by the Unit Executive Officer

Please discuss any outstanding characteristics of the staff member not covered in the preceding sections. The unit executive officer's comments should always be the last item in the dossier (with the exception of addenda included at subsequent steps in the process).

The unit executive officer is strongly encouraged to address any negative aspects of the candidate's record or the outside letters and explain why these aspects should not be decisive in the case in question.

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 from the previous year.

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).

VIII. 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 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.

Assistance

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

Attachments

- Checklist for Transmittal of Recommendation
- Recommendation for Promotion (Cover Sheet and Outline)
- Sample Letters to External Evaluator

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS • URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
RECOMMENDATION FOR SPECIALIZED FACULTY PROMOTION**

CHECK LIST FOR TRANSMITTAL OF DOSSIER:

- Recorded votes at each level of review (i.e., department, school, college) on cover sheet
- Specified author(s) of departmental evaluations of research, teaching and service
- Provided candidate's offer letter, job description (or alternatively, a statement of the candidate's job duties), including percentage of effort for teaching, research and service
- Provided copies of the departmental, school (if applicable) and college promotion policies and procedures
- Described norms/standards for scholarship in the candidate's area
- Described funding availability in the candidate's area
- Provided 1-paragraph bio sketch for each external reviewer
- Reported names of external scholars contacted who were unable to provide letter
- Addressed any weaknesses/inconsistencies in the case in EO statement
- Articulated why this promotion is in the best interest of the institution
- Name of Unit Executive Officer listed at the top of the comments page (last page of dossier)
- All pages numbered
- All pages one-sided and no staples

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS • URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
RECOMMENDATION FOR SPECIALIZED FACULTY PROMOTION

Date _____

<i>Please indicate the applicable appointment track:</i>	
Teaching professor track	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research professor track	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clinical professor track	<input type="checkbox"/>

College _____
School _____
Department _____

Name _____

Current Academic Rank _____

Recommended Rank _____

Highest Degree _____ Date Awarded _____

Institution _____ Field _____

Date of Last Promotion at Illinois _____

Date of UIUC Initial Appointment (in modified professor position) _____

Academic activities, percentage of time (average for past three years) *

- A. Instructional activities (if applicable) _____%
- B. Research activities (if applicable) _____%
- C. Professional/Disciplinary and University Service activities (if applicable) _____%

**Note: These should be determined by the Unit Executive Officer.*

Votes of Faculty Committees

Department: For _____ Against _____ Abstain _____ Recusal _____

School: For _____ Against _____ Abstain _____ Recusal _____

College: For _____ Against _____ Abstain _____ Recusal _____

**Note: Recusal should be used when person has a conflict of interest or is voting on the case at another level.*

Approvals

(For members who have joint appointments, recommendations must be approved by all units.)

Department _____ (print name) _____ (signature)

School _____ (print name) _____ (signature)

College _____ (print name) _____ (signature)

Campus Approvals

Provost (or designee) _____

Outline of Promotion Dossier

I. PERSONAL HISTORY AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

NOTE: In each section, list items in chronological order from past to present.

- A. Provide Educational Background
(Provide the name of 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

- E. Invited Lectures and Invited Conference Presentations Since Last Promotion

- F. Offices Held in Professional Societies

- G. Editorships/Guest Editorships of Journals or Other Learned Publications

- H. Grants Received
(List principal investigator first, any co-PI's, granting agency, dates of grant, and dollar amount.)

- I. Review Panels (e.g., for Governmental Agencies, Educational Institutions)

II. PUBLICATIONS AND CREATIVE WORKS

- # Denotes any publication derived from the candidate's thesis.
- * Denotes publication that has undergone stringent editorial review by peers.
- + Denotes publication that was invited and carries special prestige and recognition. (Additional symbols may be used to denote other noteworthy features. Please define.)

- A. Doctoral thesis title

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

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

- D. Chapters in Books, including textbooks (in print or accepted)

- E. Monographs (in print or accepted)

- F. Articles in Journals (in print or accepted)

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

- H. Patents

- I. Bulletins, Reports, or Conference Proceedings (in print or accepted)

- J. Abstracts (in print or accepted)

- K. Book Reviews (in print or accepted)

- L. Referred Conference Papers and Presentations

- M. Other

III. RESIDENT INSTRUCTION (TO THE EXTENT APPLICABLE)

A. Teaching and Mentoring Record

1. Descriptive Data

(Provide information for undergraduate and graduate courses, both on and off campus, in summary form, since last promotion. Provide list of courses and number of students enrolled. See instructions for format.)

2. Supervision of Graduate Student Research

(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. See example in instructions.)

3. Supervision of Undergraduate Students

(Please list all undergraduates that have been supervised in research, honors activities, service learning, or public engagement activities. See example in instructions.)

4. Other Contributions to Instructional Programs

B. Evaluation of Instruction

1. Student ICES Course Evaluation Results

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

(Three pages or less.)

3. Departmental Evaluation of Teaching and Course Documentation
(Author of evaluation: _____)

IV. SERVICE (PUBLIC, PROFESSIONAL/DISCIPLINARY, AND UNIVERSITY)

A. Summary of Service

1. Public Engagement

2. Service to Disciplinary and Professional Societies or Associations

3. University/Campus Service

B. Evaluation of Service

(Author of evaluation: _____)

1. Public Engagement

2. Service to Disciplinary and Professional Societies or Associations

3. University/Campus Service

V. RESEARCH (TO THE EXTENT APPLICABLE)

A. Candidate's Statement of Research Goals and Accomplishments
(three pages or less.)

B. Departmental Evaluation of Research Accomplishments
(with emphasis on one or two publications or creative works)
(Author of evaluation: _____)

C. Departmental Evaluation of Future Potential
(Author of evaluation: _____)

VI. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

NOTE: Please start this section on a new page.

A. Sample Letter(s) to External Evaluators

B. Qualifications of the External Evaluators

C. External Letters

VII. SPECIAL COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER

NOTE: Please start this section on a new page.

Executive Officer Name (please type): _____

VIII. SPECIAL COMMENTS BY THE DEAN (ONLY WHEN NEEDED)

NOTE: Please start this section on a new page.

Dean Name (please type): _____

Sample Letter to External Evaluator for Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor

[date]

Re: Request for evaluation of non-tenure track faculty promotion

Dear [evaluator's name],

We are considering [specialized faculty member's name] for possible promotion to the rank of Teaching Associate Professor in the [department name]. Letters of evaluation from at least three scholars or professional specialists outside the university are required for each nominee. Therefore, it would be most helpful to have your independent evaluation of [specialized faculty member's name].

At the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, non-tenure system faculty position (referred to as "specialized faculty" at Illinois) included Teaching, Clinical and Research Professors (Assistant, Associate and Full). We do not require that specialized faculty members have national reputations, rather we evaluate whether they have satisfied the campus, college and unit promotion criteria and performance expectations. Specialized faculty members make substantial contributions to our research, teaching and service missions, but their scope of work is more specific than their tenure-system peers and the performance expectations are different. At the campus level, the expectation is that Teaching Associate Professors will be making instructional contributions to the college, campus and to the broader discipline. Specific performance expectations and promotion criteria are set forth in the [insert specialized faculty member's name's] job description (attached) [alternatively:"in the statement of the individual's job duties (attached)"]. The [departmental and college or departmental, school and college or school/college] promotion criteria are:

- [insert bulleted list of criteria from each applicable level]

Samples of [faculty member's name] publications and Biodata form are attached. Our policy states that the criteria for promotion of specialized faculty at Illinois are the same regardless of length of service.

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 required specifically and legally to do so.

Because your evaluation will provide essential input in our review and because the entire review process is a lengthy one, I would appreciate receiving your comments at your earliest convenience and by [date]. If you will be unable to complete your evaluation by this date, please let me know immediately. Please email your letter to [name] at [email] and follow up with a hard copy to the following address;

[name and mailing address]

Thank you for your contribution to this important process.

Sincerely,

[department head name]

Enclosures

Sample Letter to External Evaluator for Promotion to Teaching Professor

[date]

Re: Request for evaluation of non-tenure track faculty promotion

Dear [evaluator's name],

We are considering [specialized faculty member's name] for possible promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor in the [department name]. Letters of evaluation from at least three scholars or professional specialists outside the university are required for each nominee. Therefore, it would be most helpful to have your independent evaluation of [specialized faculty member's name].

At the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, non-tenure system faculty position (referred to as "specialized faculty" at Illinois) included Teaching, Clinical and Research Professors (Assistant, Associate and Full). We do not require that specialized faculty members have national reputations, rather we evaluate whether they have satisfied the campus, college and unit promotion criteria and performance expectations. Specialized faculty members make substantial contributions to our research, teaching and service missions, but their scope of work is more specific than their tenure-system peers and the performance expectations are different. At the campus level, the expectation is that Teaching Professors will be making contributions to teaching and pedagogy at the college and campus levels, including making advancements in teaching and learning in the discipline that leads to innovative strategies and marked course improvement. At the level of Teaching Professor, the expectation is that the individual is making broader contributions to pedagogy, for example, by sharing creative and scholarly work at conferences and in publications, publishing textbooks in reputable presses, securing competitive internal or external grants to develop curriculum or pedagogy, and effective mentoring of instructors, lecturers, and graduate assistants. Specific performance expectations and promotion criteria are set forth in the [insert specialized faculty member's name's] job description (attached) [alternatively:"in the statement of the individual's job duties (attached)"]. The [departmental and college or departmental, school and college or school/college] promotion criteria are:

- [insert bulleted list of criteria from each applicable level]

Samples of [faculty member's name] publications and Biodata form are attached. Our policy states that the criteria for promotion of specialized faculty at Illinois are the same regardless of length of service.

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 required specifically and legally to do so.

Because your evaluation will provide essential input in our review and because the entire review process is a lengthy one, I would appreciate receiving your comments at your earliest convenience and by [date]. If you will be unable to complete your evaluation by this date, please let me know immediately. Please email your letter to [name] at [email] and follow up with a hard copy to the following address;

[name and mailing address]

Thank you for your contribution to this important process.

Sincerely,

[department head name]

Enclosures

Sample Letter to External Evaluator for Promotion to Research Associate Professor

[date]

Re: Request for evaluation of non-tenure track faculty promotion

Dear [evaluator's name],

We are considering [specialized faculty member's name] for possible promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor in the [department name]. Letters of evaluation from at least three scholars or professional specialists outside the university are required for each nominee. Therefore, it would be most helpful to have your independent evaluation of [specialized faculty member's name].

At the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, non-tenure system faculty position (referred to as "specialized faculty" at Illinois) included Teaching, Clinical and Research Professors (Assistant, Associate and Full). We do not require that specialized faculty members have national reputations, rather we evaluate whether they have satisfied the campus, college and unit promotion criteria and performance expectations. Specialized faculty members make substantial contributions to our research, teaching and service missions, but their scope of work is more specific than their tenure-system peers and the performance expectations are different. At the campus level, the expectation is that Research Associate Professors have demonstrated the ability to make a substantial impact in a research area, as shown by publications, invited talks, external funding and other related activities. Specific performance expectations and promotion criteria are set forth in the [insert specialized faculty member's name's] job description (attached) [alternatively:"in the statement of the individual's job duties (attached)"]. The [departmental and college or departmental, school and college or school/college] promotion criteria are:

- [insert bulleted list of criteria from each applicable level]

Samples of [faculty member's name] publications and Biodata form are attached. Our policy states that the criteria for promotion of specialized faculty at Illinois are the same regardless of length of service.

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 required specifically and legally to do so.

Because your evaluation will provide essential input in our review and because the entire review process is a lengthy one, I would appreciate receiving your comments at your earliest convenience and by [date]. If you will be unable to complete your evaluation by this date, please let me know immediately. Please email your letter to [name] at [email] and follow up with a hard copy to the following address;

[name and mailing address]

Thank you for your contribution to this important process.

Sincerely,

[department head name]

Enclosures

Sample Letter to External Evaluator for Promotion to Research Professor

[date]

Re: Request for evaluation of non-tenure track faculty promotion

Dear [evaluator's name],

We are considering [specialized faculty member's name] for possible promotion to the rank of Research Professor in the [department name]. Letters of evaluation from at least three scholars or professional specialists outside the university are required for each nominee. Therefore, it would be most helpful to have your independent evaluation of [specialized faculty member's name].

At the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, non-tenure system faculty position (referred to as "specialized faculty" at Illinois) included Teaching, Clinical and Research Professors (Assistant, Associate and Full). We do not require that specialized faculty members have national reputations, rather we evaluate whether they have satisfied the campus, college and unit promotion criteria and performance expectations. Specialized faculty members make substantial contributions to our research, teaching and service missions, but their scope of work is more specific than their tenure-system peers and the performance expectations are different. At the campus level, the expectation is that Research Professors have demonstrated the fulfilled promised to make a substantial impact in a research area, as shown by making discoveries that lead to grant funding and publications in leading peer-reviewed journals or publications. Specific performance expectations and promotion criteria are set forth in the [insert specialized faculty member's name's] job description (attached) [alternatively:"in the statement of the individual's job duties (attached)"]. The [departmental and college or departmental, school and college or school/college] promotion criteria are:

- [insert bulleted list of criteria from each applicable level]

Samples of [faculty member's name] publications and Biodata form are attached. Our policy states that the criteria for promotion of specialized faculty at Illinois are the same regardless of length of service.

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 required specifically and legally to do so.

Because your evaluation will provide essential input in our review and because the entire review process is a lengthy one, I would appreciate receiving your comments at your earliest convenience and by [date]. If you will be unable to complete your evaluation by this date, please let me know immediately. Please email your letter to [name] at [email] and follow up with a hard copy to the following address;

[name and mailing address]

Thank you for your contribution to this important process.

Sincerely,

[department head name]

Enclosures

Sample Letter to External Evaluator for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

[date]

Re: Request for evaluation of non-tenure track faculty promotion

Dear [evaluator's name],

We are considering [specialized faculty member's name] for possible promotion to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor in the [department name]. Letters of evaluation from at least three scholars or professional specialists outside the university are required for each nominee. Therefore, it would be most helpful to have your independent evaluation of [specialized faculty member's name].

At the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, non-tenure system faculty position (referred to as "specialized faculty" at Illinois) included Teaching, Clinical and Research Professors (Assistant, Associate and Full). Clinical faculty members are primarily engaged in providing instruction and do so from the perspective of a practitioner, either within a traditional classroom setting or a lab or other applied learning environment. We do not require that specialized faculty members have national reputations, rather we evaluate whether they have satisfied the campus, college and unit promotion criteria and performance expectations. Specialized faculty members make substantial contributions to our research, teaching and service missions, but their scope of work is more specific than their tenure-system peers and the performance expectations are different. Specific performance expectations and promotion criteria are set forth in the [insert specialized faculty member's name's] job description (attached) [alternatively:"in the statement of the individual's job duties (attached)"]. The [departmental and college or departmental, school and college or school/college] promotion criteria are:

- [insert bulleted list of criteria from each applicable level]

Samples of [faculty member's name] publications and Biodata form are attached. Our policy states that the criteria for promotion of specialized faculty at Illinois are the same regardless of length of service.

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 required specifically and legally to do so.

Because your evaluation will provide essential input in our review and because the entire review process is a lengthy one, I would appreciate receiving your comments at your earliest convenience and by [date]. If you will be unable to complete your evaluation by this date, please let me know immediately. Please email your letter to [name] at [email] and follow up with a hard copy to the following address;

[name and mailing address]

Thank you for your contribution to this important process.

Sincerely,

[department head name]

Enclosures

Sample Letter to External Evaluator for Promotion to Clinical Professor

[date]

Re: Request for evaluation of non-tenure track faculty promotion

Dear [evaluator's name],

We are considering [specialized faculty member's name] for possible promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor in the [department name]. Letters of evaluation from at least three scholars or professional specialists outside the university are required for each nominee. Therefore, it would be most helpful to have your independent evaluation of [specialized faculty member's name].

At the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, non-tenure system faculty position (referred to as "specialized faculty" at Illinois) included Teaching, Clinical and Research Professors (Assistant, Associate and Full). Clinical faculty members are primarily engaged in providing instruction and do so from the perspective of a practitioner, either within a traditional classroom setting or a lab or other applied learning environment. We do not require that specialized faculty members have national reputations, rather we evaluate whether they have satisfied the campus, college and unit promotion criteria and performance expectations. Specialized faculty members make substantial contributions to our research, teaching and service missions, but their scope of work is more specific than their tenure-system peers and the performance expectations are different. Specific performance expectations and promotion criteria are set forth in the [insert specialized faculty member's name's] job description (attached) [alternatively:"in the statement of the individual's job duties (attached)"]. The [departmental and college or departmental, school and college or school/college] promotion criteria are:

- [insert bulleted list of criteria from each applicable level]

Samples of [faculty member's name] publications and Biodata form are attached. Our policy states that the criteria for promotion of specialized faculty at Illinois are the same regardless of length of service.

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 required specifically and legally to do so.

Because your evaluation will provide essential input in our review and because the entire review process is a lengthy one, I would appreciate receiving your comments at your earliest convenience and by [date]. If you will be unable to complete your evaluation by this date, please let me know immediately. Please email your letter to [name] at [email] and follow up with a hard copy to the following address;

[name and mailing address]

Thank you for your contribution to this important process.

Sincerely,

[department head name]

Enclosures

SHARED GOVERNANCE FOR ACADEMIC UNITS

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
COMMUNICATION NO. 27

Overview

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign has a long and proud tradition of strong shared governance. Faculty members and faculty leaders in administrative roles are committed to ensuring that shared governance is practiced throughout academic programs, departments, schools, colleges, and the campus. In a shared governance system, decisions are made through a process that rests upon collegial and collaborative consultation. The University of Illinois *Statutes* express the centrality of the decision-making power of the faculty to the functioning of the University:

As the responsible body in the teaching, research, and scholarly activities of the University, the faculty has inherent interests and rights in academic policy and governance. Each college or other academic unit shall be governed in its internal administration by its faculty. . . Governance of each academic unit shall be based on unit bylaws established and amended by the faculty of that unit (University Statutes II.3.b).

For some key decisions, such as setting the unit budget or making recommendations regarding promotion or tenure, the unit Executive Officer (EO) is *required to engage in* faculty consultation according to campus and university governing documents. Furthermore, some policies dictate that particular processes be followed that include documentation of faculty advice. In most cases, the input of the faculty is advisory; it is the EO who ultimately is accountable for the consequences of decisions made by the unit. In general, however, decision-making processes that include constructive, open, and honest input from all involved will yield wiser decisions and, in turn, help build stronger academic units.

The goal of this Communication is to provide guidelines that will help EOs to lead their units effectively and harmoniously. EOs are encouraged to go beyond the practices outlined here and to deeply integrate the enactment of the principles of shared governance into their unit leadership.

This document was developed in partnership with the General University Policy Committee of the Academic Senate.

Guidelines on Information Sharing and Transparency

The following practices regarding the sharing of policies and information should be followed in academic programs, departments, schools, and colleges.

- Unit bylaws are made readily available to everyone in the unit (e.g., posted on the website, distributed to new faculty) and are followed conscientiously.
- At a minimum, unit bylaws specify:
 - definition of unit faculty
 - rights and privileges of tenure-system faculty, with and without joint appointments
 - rights and privileges granted by the tenure-track faculty to unit specialized faculty, affiliate or zero-time faculty members, students, or staff
 - grievance procedures for faculty and students
 - procedures for amendments of the bylaws
- College, campus, and University governing documents are shared and are followed conscientiously.
- Lists of unit committee composition and charges are made readily available to unit faculty.
- The full unit faculty meet with the EO as necessary, at least once a year.
- Schedules of unit meetings are announced well in advance and items for meeting agendas are invited several days in advance.

Guidelines Involving Unit Faculty in Unit Decision Making

The following decision-making practices should be followed in academic programs, departments, schools, and colleges.

- The EO consults with the advisory/executive committee in preparing the unit budget, in accordance with the *University Statutes* (II.3.d.8; III.5.b.8; IV.2.d; IV.3.d7).
- Short-term and long-term hiring priorities are determined through discussion among appropriate faculty groups and the EO.
- Formal strategic planning exercises for the unit are carried out yearly or at appropriate intervals and centrally involve all unit faculty.
- Matters central to the academic mission of the unit, such as graduate admissions, curricula, and course assignments are discussed by duly constituted committees, whose recommendations are shared and discussed with the faculty.
- Sufficient time is allowed during faculty meetings for full discussion of agenda items; faculty meetings are not simply a series of announcements and presentations.
- The EO generally acts in accord with advice from the faculty; the EO may need, on occasion, to make a decision that contradicts advice from the faculty. When such a situation arises; the EO reports back about the reasons for such a decision.

Guidelines for Faculty Mentoring, Development, and Evaluation

The following practices and policies regarding faculty development should be followed in academic programs, departments, schools, and colleges (*see Provost Communication 21 for required elements of annual review*):

http://provost.illinois.edu/communication/21/2013/Communication_21.pdf).

- The EO ensures the wide availability of the unit's written procedures for yearly evaluation of faculty members, including a statement of the unit mission and expectations for faculty members' contribution to that mission.
- Each faculty member in the unit receives an oral or written evaluation of annual progress and is given an opportunity to respond.
- The EO ensures that a mentoring process is available for all pre-tenure and mid-career faculty in the unit.
- The EO regularly shares information about campus and unit resources potentially available for faculty development (travel funds, research funds, access to RA assistance, fellowship and teaching release opportunities, etc.) and how to apply for these resources.

Guidelines for Faculty Participation in Unit, Campus and University Shared Governance

The following practices should be followed to encourage faculty awareness of and involvement in shared governance across the campus.

- The EO shares information about the basic administrative and governance structures of the campus and the University.
- Unit faculty members are provided assistance in how to navigate campus administrative processes such as approvals of curricular proposals.
- The EO shares information about the role of the campus Senate and the Graduate College, and their basic committee structures.
- The EO ensures that timely elections are held for faculty representation to the campus Senate, in coordination with the Office of the Senate (www.senate.illinois.edu).
- The EO encourages all voting faculty members to nominate and elect qualified representatives to the campus Senate.
- The EO encourages departmental Senators to regularly report to the unit on the work of the Senate.
- Faculty members are encouraged to participate in shared governance committees within their unit, school, college and campus.
- The EO ensures that service and leadership activities on campus are recognized in the annual performance evaluation of faculty.

Practicing Shared Governance on Campus

The Provost's Office encourages widespread dissemination and incorporation of these guidelines. To ensure that these principles are woven into the fabric of academic decision making, all new faculty members should be made aware of this document. In addition, EOs (e.g., department chairs/heads, directors, deans) should be required to commit to the principles

when accepting new leadership positions and should incorporate the principles in their annual reviews of leadership activities.

Suggestions for implementing these practices for faculty include:

- Sharing this document with new faculty during the campus-wide orientation (Illinois New Faculty Orientation).
- Providing this document to newly tenured faculty in the letter from the Provost that confers tenure and promotion.

Suggestions for implementing these practices for EOs include:

- Providing this Communication in all offer letters made to new department chairs/heads, new directors, and new deans.
- Ensuring that all department heads/chairs, directors, and deans address how they have fostered shared governance in their annual reports of leadership activities in their units.

Additional Resources

Campus Administrative Manual: <http://cam.illinois.edu>

University of Illinois *Statutes*: <http://www.bot.uillinois.edu/statutes>

University of Illinois *General Rules*: <http://www.bot.uillinois.edu/general-rules>

AAUP Joint Statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities:
<http://www.aaup.org/report/1966-statement-government-colleges-and-universities>

AAUP Evaluation of Shared Governance:
<http://www.aaup.org/issues/governance-colleges-universities/evaluation>