

# **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

Department of Urban and Regional Planning

College of Fine and Applied Arts

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

*Last Revisions Adopted April 19, 2007*

## **1. OBJECTIVES**

This document sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed in developing proposals for promotion and tenure and for internal review and action on candidates being considered for promotion and tenure by this Department. The policies and procedures are organized so as to be consistent with the policies and recommendations set out by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs communications pertaining to these subjects. The current versions are incorporated by reference and should be distributed with this document (*Communication #9: Promotion and Tenure; Communication #13: Review of Faculty in Year Three of the Probationary Period; Communication #10: Guidelines and Procedures for Notice of Nonreappointment for Nontenured Faculty Members*).

The objective of these policies and procedures is to guide faculty in pursuing activities consistent with Department expectations for promotion and to set out procedures for review and recommendation to college and campus reviewers. The ultimate objective is to build the best possible faculty by providing early and continuous guidance to tenure track faculty and by making appropriate decisions (see 2. below). In all cases of promotion and tenure, this Department will comply with the principles of affirmative action policy applied in recruitment as set forth by the Office of the Chancellor.

## **2. GUIDANCE OF FACULTY**

While recognizing that promotion and tenure is not a right but a status to be earned, the Department acknowledges its duty to take an affirmative interest in the advancement of its faculty and is prepared to make this interest effective in a number of ways:

An orientation by the Head at the time of hiring, informing the new member of the nature and requirements of the tenure track process.

For assistant professors, a mandatory two-year review of the faculty member's progress to date, including a written report by the Promotion and Tenure Committee (see below for membership) detailing the member's strengths and weaknesses in so far as they bear on promotability. The aim is to make possible in-course corrections should they be necessary, to encourage mentoring, and to inform the committee of the work of assistant professors. Assistant professors may also request a review in the fourth year of their tenure period.

The campus requires a third year review of tenure track faculty, as specified in Provost's

*Communication #13: Review of Faculty in Year Three of the Probationary Period.* Faculty with tenure code 3 submit their dossier, following the guidelines of *Communication #9*, along with selected publications by January 15, and the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee meets to review the materials in early February. Based upon the Committee's recommendations, the Head prepares a letter to the faculty member for review by the Dean in mid-February. Following the Dean's review and possible revisions to the letter by the Head, the faculty member receives a written report signed by the Head and Dean.

For associate professors, a mandatory review every four years of the faculty member's progress to date, including a written report by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee detailing the member's strengths and weaknesses in so far as they bear on promotability. The aim is to make possible in-course corrections, to encourage mentoring toward promotion, and to inform the committee of the progress of associate professors. The Head or faculty may initiate additional reviews, as needed.

Encouragement of senior faculty to share their experience with junior faculty and to engage with them to the greatest mutually acceptable extent in joint teaching and research endeavors. Senior faculty are expected to take an interest in efforts of junior faculty to make themselves and their work known in the wider scholarly community and to this end should advise them concerning publication outlets and opportunities. Junior faculty may choose to take advantage of the Department's faculty mentoring system, described in the Department's *Policy Guidelines for Mentoring Junior Faculty*.

For all faculty, periodic reviews of teaching, as described in the Department's *Policies and Procedures for Peer Review of Faculty Teaching*.

The primary responsibility for advancement lies with the junior faculty member, who should take an active role at an early stage of employment in learning the pitfalls and searching out the resources that lie along the path to tenure.

### **3. CRITERIA**

This section sets forth those criteria which will be used in evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure.

#### **RELEVANCE TO THE PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT**

The diversity of urban and regional planning practice and the complexity of problems faced in such practice encompass a wide range of academic and professional interests. This results in a faculty of diverse skills and backgrounds, including practice-oriented members and specialists from allied fields.

This condition makes it imperative to recognize as essential to the mission of the Department a variety of functions, credentials, and areas of growth and development, ranging from practice to applied and theoretical research. In order to maintain this diversity, the guidelines for evaluation

of faculty recognize that persons from disciplines other than planning are not expected to become planners or to abandon their basic disciplines. All members of the Department, nonetheless, have a responsibility to participate in the educational, research, and public service programs of the Department in ways that will enhance the breadth and quality of the planning discipline. It must also be recognized that a considerable proportion of research in the field is of an applied nature and that the relevant outlets for publication most open to faculty efforts include a mixture of professional practice and applied and theoretical research.

It is therefore the policy of the Department, in evaluating the activities of each candidate, to take into consideration the academic background and orientation of each individual and their relevance to the Departmental goals and programs. It shall also be the policy to take into account other factors insofar as they affect the good name of the Department and its ability to conduct efficiently and in a timely manner its various teaching, research, and public service responsibilities.

#### **GENERAL CRITERIA**

A candidate for promotion to associate professor should present evidence showing “real promise that he or she will become a leading researcher/teacher/scholar. Promise should, in fact, be fortified by tangible, developing evidence.”

Candidates for promotion to professor should show “promise fulfilled” based on “evidence of attainment of national or international stature in a field.”

#### **EVIDENCE**

Evidence of such recognition shall consist of the following or equivalent factors:

- Work known and widely cited in regard to teaching, research, professional practice or service;
- National or international awards;
- Publication in refereed journals or journals with national or international circulation;
- Leadership or major responsibility with respect to national or international organizations and their activities;
- Appointment to national or international commissions;
- Presentation of refereed papers at professional seminars and colloquia.

Evidence in support of educational, professional, research and scholarship, and service activities will be considered in accordance with the provisions listed there. In all of these areas, a mandatory source of evidence will consist of letters from peers who are leading authorities capable of evaluating the candidate. Other sources of evidence may be presented as listed below.

Consideration for promotion and tenure will require demonstrable evidence that the individual is an effective teacher. Evidence for the evaluation of educational performance will include the course evaluation forms as well as evidence submitted for peer evaluation such as the types of evidence listed below:

- Letters from former colleagues;
- Statements of teaching objectives;
- Evaluation from students previously enrolled;

- Course syllabi and other written materials;
- Effective procedures and methods;
- Publications related to teaching;
- Demonstration of successful application of methods and materials;
- Copies of advanced projects or theses supervised;
- Lists of successful and eminent thesis-master's project advisees.

To supplement these items, classroom visitations will be made in accord with campus policy.

For the purposes of peer evaluation of teaching (as for the evaluation of other types of performance) the authorized peer evaluation group is the Department faculty of equal or higher rank. In cases where the faculty desires additional expertise for a judgment, it may refer the material in question to qualified outside personnel for an opinion.

Evidence to support professional activities should delineate the innovative character of the work, its importance to the profession, and the level of responsibility for the work by the individual concerned. A mandatory source of evidence shall be written evaluation by individuals who are recognized as experts in the appropriate area. Other possible sources of evidence may include:

- Reports, plans, programs, and other products relevant to undertaking an assignment;
- Awards and other special recognition;
- Consistent citation of works in publications by other individuals;
- Books, articles, papers, workshops, and addresses undertaken in connection with the professional project beyond that called for in the project;
- Offices and Committee assignments in professional organizations;
- Editing of a professional journal or newsletter, a special issue thereof, or a widely used report or book;
- Participation in professional meetings and conferences;
- High-level professional assignments and responsibilities.

Evidence to support research and scholarly activities should likewise stress their innovative character, importance to the field, and level of responsibility by the candidate. A mandatory source of evidence shall be written evaluation by qualified individuals. Other possible sources of evidence may include:

- Books, research monographs, and articles published in refereed journals;
- Research proposals and conceptualizations;
- Grants and contracts received;
- Research papers presented at conferences and workshops;
- Research organization and administration;
- Research awards and citations.

Evidence to support professionally related public and University service should identify the significant problems to be resolved in connection with the assignments undertaken, the goals and policies established, and the accomplishments. Innovations should be stressed and the importance of the work to the field, to civic organizations or elected bodies, to public interest groups, or to the University should be delineated.

A mandatory source of evidence shall be written evaluation of superiors, staff, participants, and others with whom the candidate has dealt. Other possible sources of evidence may include:

- Reports, handbooks, or other materials for which the candidate is primarily responsible
- Awards and citations
- Offices held
- Administration and supervision of organizations and programs

Faculty may give such weight to the evidence presented as they deem appropriate to any item, but there shall be no scale fixed for the criteria listed herein. It is assumed that differentials do exist, e.g., that a full length scholarly manuscript counts more heavily than either a textbook or an article. But if the preceding characteristics can be demonstrated on behalf of an item submitted by a candidate, that item should be given a commensurate weight in the evaluation.

#### **4. PROCEDURES**

The principals involved in the promotion and tenure process shall be the candidate, the Department Head, and the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, the latter to consist of all members of the faculty of rank equal to or higher rank than that to which the candidate is seeking promotion, excluding the Department Head even if of appropriate rank.

##### **PROMOTION (DATES ARE APPROXIMATE)**

Date: March 1

Purpose: Request Assistant Professors in Tenure Year 5 to initiate promotion process.

Head: Request all faculty in Tenure Year 5 to submit a draft promotion dossier by March 15.

Date: March 1

Purpose: Invite other Assistant and Associate Professors to consider initiating promotion process.

Head: Invite all faculty members with the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor to submit a draft promotion dossier for review by Head by March 15.

Date: March 15-30

Purpose: Discuss expectations for promotion process and decide whether to initiate.

Head: Meet with all faculty in Tenure Year 5 to discuss the process. For other faculty considering promotion, the Head will consult with each candidate and with members of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, as appropriate, to help the candidate decide whether to initiate the promotion process.

Date: April 1

Purpose: Submit dossier to Department P&T Committee for initial review.

Candidate: Submit to the Department P&T Committee a draft dossier and all factual material relating to the activities which he or she deems pertinent to his or her case for promotion, following the guidelines set forth in *Communication #9: Promotion and Tenure*. The materials should include selected articles, course syllabi, and a summary of course evaluations.

Date: April 1-30

Purpose: Initial review by Department P&T Committee.

P&T Committee: Review the materials for content, clarity, and format. For candidates other than those in Tenure Year 5, the Committee will recommend whether to proceed with the promotion process. The Committee will provide its comments to the candidate regarding the draft dossier, and will present recommendations, as appropriate, to the Head. The Committee will present the Head with a list of suggested external reviewers for each candidate expected to proceed with the promotion process.

Date: May 1-15

Purpose: Revise dossier for external evaluation, formally seek promotion.

Candidate: In response to Committee comments, the candidate will revise the dossier for purposes of external evaluation. Submitting the dossier to the Head will signal a formal request to be considered for promotion. The candidate will submit a list of approximately three or four suggested external reviewers.

Date: May 15

Purpose: Discuss expectations for external evaluation.

Candidate and Head: Meet to determine the nature and source of formal evaluations to be obtained from external reviewers as set forth in campus guidelines. The candidate and Head will agree on which publications to include in the package.

Date: May 15-30

Purpose: Assemble materials and send to external reviewers.

Candidate: Supply publications to be copied.

Head: The Head will finalize the list of external reviewers and will send the materials so as to receive those reviewers' evaluations by July 30. The Head will seek responses from five reviewers, the majority of whom were not selected by the candidate.

Date: August 1-10

Purpose: Department P&T Committee schedule activities, in order to deliver recommendations by September 15.

Head: Inform the Department P&T Committee of its charge and schedule for the year. The Head will transmit the prepared factual material and external evaluations to the Committee for evaluation with respect to the candidate's contributions to the Department's teaching, research and public service responsibilities.

P&T: Schedule meeting dates and assignments.

Date: August 10-September 15

Purpose: Department P&T Committee to evaluate the candidate.

P&T Committee: The Committee will elect a Chairperson from among its members. The Committee should decide promptly on meeting dates and committee tasks, so as to allow adequate time to examine the candidate's material, read reviewers' letters, and reflect on the case. Faculty who may be on leave or in prolonged travel will be given an opportunity to comment in writing, if they are qualified for membership on the Committee. The Department P&T Committee, in addition to its own deliberations, shall be free to seek such outside opinion

as it may deem necessary to arrive at a correct and fair evaluation of the candidate's contributions. The committee will prepare the evaluative portion of the papers, writing the reports on instruction, research, and service.

Date: September 15

Purpose: Decision by Department P&T Committee.

P&T Committee: The date of the voting meeting should be announced so as to allow sufficient time for Committee members to plan to attend the meeting. Three-quarters of the Committee rounded to the nearest lower integer shall constitute a quorum for holding a valid promotion and tenure meeting to discuss and vote on a candidate. All meetings shall be closed and all voting for or against a motion to promote shall be by secret ballot. Meetings and voting can include participants by electronic means, so long as equivalent participation and voting secrecy are achieved. The Committee will submit the final dossier, evaluative statements, and results of its vote to the Head. The Committee and the Head may arrange to meet jointly to discuss the case, at the request of either.

Date: September 15-30

Purpose: Decision by Head

Head: The Head, using the information supplied by the Committee, will make a determination to approve or disapprove the Committee's recommendation. If the Head is not in agreement with the recommendation, he or she will review the recommendation with the Committee before reaching a final decision. The Head may decide to recommend or deny promotion.

### Appeals

If the Head does not recommend promotion, the Head will consult with the candidate and discuss appropriate steps. If the applicant is not satisfied with the decision, the appeal procedure available within the University may be followed by the candidate.

If the decision of the Head is not approved at further levels in the process (e.g., at the college level, the Campus Promotion Committee, or the Provost), the Head will confer with the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee before taking further action or appeal with respect to the proposed promotion. The Head will then take appropriate action.

Note: Procedures for appeals by the candidate at various points in the process are outlined in *Provost Communication #10: Guidelines and Procedures for Notice of Nonreappointment for Nontenured Faculty Members*. Depending on the basis for appeal, possibilities include a request for reconsideration at the level at which denial occurred, departmental grievance procedures outlined in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning Bylaws, College of Fine and Applied Arts grievance procedures outlined in College bylaws, the Faculty Advisory Committee, or the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

### **HIRING NEW FACULTY AT A RANK ABOVE ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

In the case of hiring new faculty to a rank above assistant professor or to tenure, a promotion and/or tenure decision is implicit even if there is no change in rank for the faculty member under consideration.

The entire faculty of the Department regardless of rank participates in a meeting in which the Head proposes the rank and tenure status at which the candidate should be hired. To hold such a meeting, three-fourths of the Department's tenured faculty members (including the Head), rounded to the nearest lower integer, must be present.

All those present discuss all aspects of the motion. This motion may include revisions to the rank and tenure recommended by the Head. Once such a motion is developed, all faculty who are greater than or equal in rank or tenure to the rank and tenure in the motion will vote on the motion, by written secret ballot.

The vote and the essence of the discussions, as well as the Head's recommendation for or against hiring the candidate, are immediately reported to the Dean. The Head's report is made available to the voting faculty members.

### **THIRD-YEAR REVIEWS (DATES ARE APPROXIMATE)**

#### January 8

The Head will ask all faculty in Tenure Year 3 to submit a dossier and selected papers to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for review.

#### January 15

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will receive the materials and organize a method for review, allowing sufficient time to reflect upon and discuss each case.

#### February 12

The Promotion and Tenure Committee will submit their written review to the Head.

#### February 19

The Head will submit a report to the faculty member to the Dean for review.

#### March

Upon review and consultation with the Dean, the Head will issue a written report, signed by the Head and the Dean. The Head will present the report to the faculty member and place it in the personnel file.

### **PRE-PROMOTION REVIEWS (DATES ARE APPROXIMATE)**

#### January 8

The Head will ask all faculty in Tenure Year 2, as well as others who so choose, to submit a dossier and selected papers to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee for review.

#### January 20

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will receive the materials and organize a method for review, allowing sufficient time to reflect upon and discuss each case.

#### February 12, or soon thereafter

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will submit their written review to the Head.

March

The Head will prepare a written review and present it to the faculty member.

**PRE-PROMOTION ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR REVIEWS (DATES ARE APPROXIMATE)**

March 15

The Head will ask all Associate Professors in their 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> years, as well as others who so choose, to submit a dossier and selected papers to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee for review.

April 1

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will receive the materials and organize a method for review, allowing sufficient time to reflect upon and discuss each case.

April 30

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will submit their written review to the Head.

May

The Head will prepare a brief written review, assessing when to seek promotion, and will present it to the faculty member.