

**College of Fine and Applied Arts
Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures (Updated: 05/2024)**

Provost's Communication No. 9 is the definitive guide for units and tenure-system faculty on promotion and tenure at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Since 2023-2024, Provost's Communication No. 9 also includes the Publicly Engaged Research Option (PERO). Provost's Communication No. 26 outlines promotion to Teaching, Research, or Clinical Associate or Full Professor Titles. The College of Fine and Applied Arts' Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures (this document) aims to assist faculty members and units in FAA carry out the processes described in Provost's Communications. Though individual academic units may add their own processes to those set forth here or in the Provost's document, such processes should not contradict those in place at the college or campus levels.

Sections I through VI of this document includes guidance for tenure system cases and Section VII includes guidance for specialized faculty cases.

I. Timeline Summary: Path to Tenure and Promotion (for Assistant Professors starting at Year One)

- Year 1:* Orientation to the process. Initiate mentoring relationships.
- Year 3:* Third-year review begins in fall with evaluation of teaching and concludes in spring with meeting to review letter of evaluation. For tenure candidates selecting PERO, the PERO-Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will need to be submitted to the PERO Advisory Committee in early fall and then signed by the candidate, the EO, and the Dean by end of spring of the 3rd year.
- Year 4:* For tenure candidates who have selected PERO, the MOU will need to be updated at the end of the 4th year.
- Year 5:* Review for tenure begins in fall with evaluation of teaching. Tenure candidate works with unit, and unit works with college to prepare dossier for dissemination to external reviewers over the summer. During this time, PERO candidates, in consultation with their EO, may opt-out of PERO prior to the submission of their list of external reviewers.
- Year 6:* Tenure case proceeds through review by unit, college, and campus-level committees.
- Year 12:* Application for promotion to Professor typically begins no earlier than six years following promotion to Associate Professor, though earlier applications are possible. Strength of the case should determine the time of application. Once initiated, that process conforms closely to that of years five and six of the tenure process.

II. Responsibilities of Academic Units

The unit executive officer is responsible for coordinating all aspects of the unit's contribution to promotion and tenure processes, working with faculty to achieve the following:

1. New faculty should be informed about the promotion and tenure process and criteria as part of orientation to the unit. Units assign at least one mentor to each new faculty member for purposes of advising through the tenure-track. FAA policies and guidelines for mentoring are available [here](#).
2. Annual reviews as specified in Communication No. 21 should take place for probationary faculty with progress toward tenure and promotion in mind. Units are strongly urged to format annual activity reports according to the dossier format outlined in Provost's Communication No. 9 and further specified in the college template (Appendix B). For faculty who have selected PERO, annual reviews will include any needed revisions to the MOU.
3. Each academic unit should maintain a document that outlines general guidelines for what constitutes evidence of impact for that unit's discipline or sub-disciplines. This document should be easily accessible and subject to regular review through shared governance processes. The document should acknowledge and provide information on PERO and recommend faculty to access [PERO guidelines](#) on the Office of the Provost website.
4. Units are responsible for ensuring that faculty candidates format their dossiers with close adherence to the college template.
5. Units should meet all deadlines described in the detailed timeline in Appendix A of this document.
6. Units should consult with faculty candidates regarding the timing of classroom visits in service of internal evaluations. Such visits should take place the year prior to the year of evaluation for Promotion or Tenure. The strongest evaluations (and the strongest teaching) result from conducting regular reviews.
7. Once application for tenure or promotion has formally begun at the unit-level evaluation stage, candidates for promotion should be informed of their progress only in the instance of an unsuccessful case or at the successful conclusion of the process at the behest of the Provost.

III. Guidelines for External Referees

Provost's Communication No. 9 provides important guidance regarding external and internal evaluation. In this and next section, the college offers some advice and expectations for how to ensure that this component of the promotion and tenure review process serves cases well.

1. Units should submit a draft list of referees to the College for advice and review.
2. Each case should include no less than five letters from external referees. Of the five, the majority should be selected without the candidate's knowledge, chosen by the unit Promotion and Tenure Committee or other School leadership, as determined by unit policy. The others should be selected from a list provided by the candidate. The candidate may also indicate one or two potential referees that the candidate would wish NOT to be consulted; unit leadership may heed such a request at their own discretion.
3. In PERO cases, two of the five external letters will need come from experts outside academia qualified to evaluate the candidate's dossier. Selection of these reviewers will

follow the evaluator types specified in the candidate's PERO-MOU. The PERO Advisory Committee will provide feedback on the list of non-academic external evaluators proposed when it reviews the MOU in the candidate's 3rd year.

4. Referees should be directed to review research and creative work, and not the teaching and service record. For PERO cases, guidance will be given to external evaluators on the criteria for review of publicly engaged research, using the MOU as a basis for evidence.
5. External referees should NOT receive internal evaluations as part of the dossier.
6. It is expected that a majority of the referees be from peer institutions. Evaluation by a recognized leader from an institution not considered peer should be well-contextualized in the reviewer's biography.

IV. Guidelines for Departmental Review of Research, Teaching, and Service

1. Internal evaluations serve as complements to the work of external referees. Unit evaluations of research, teaching, and service should be evidence-based, substantive, and written for an audience of non-experts.
2. Unit evaluators may not access letters from external referees as they prepare their independent evaluations. Once the internal evaluation narratives are complete, the P&T Committee may access external letters and internal evaluations for discussion and voting purposes.
3. In most cases, the unit executive officer assigns evaluators, unless such activities are delegated to others by the UEO or as part of unit bylaws and policies. In assigning evaluation duties, the first priority is to ensure that evaluators have a full view of the work to be reviewed. It is generally not in the interest of the case to have the same person serve as the lead evaluator for all three areas of research, teaching, and service.
4. Evaluation of a candidate's teaching, research or service record is by nature deliberative, and benefits from group consultation. In order to get a full view of a candidate's work, it is typically necessary for the individual or group charged with conducting these reviews to consult others, from within or beyond the membership the Promotion and Tenure Committee, as determined by policies of the unit.
5. No matter the number of people involved in crafting these reviews, only one author for each section (research, teaching, and service) should be listed. The aim of internal reviews should be to evaluate the work as well as to synthesize the deliberative observations of a group into a narrative, that reflects reasonably differing views among evaluators, when applicable.
6. Evaluation narratives should be more than merely descriptive, instead based on claims and judgments, backed up with evidence, articulating the basis for positive or negative assessment. It is also often helpful to provide context to help educate readers about the field and the significance of the quality, subject, or impact of the work being reviewed.
7. It is important to limit reviews of the right material to the right component of the dossier, avoiding evaluation of teaching as part of a research evaluation, for example. Reviews of public engagement should be part of evaluation of service, unless the candidate's original appointment explicitly named public engagement as part of his or her research duties (thus requiring an additional process as specified in Communication No. 9). When

reviewing PERO dossiers, public engagement is to be reviewed as research, following guidelines in Provost Communication No. 9 and following the candidate's MOU. A member of the PERO Advisory Committee will meet with Unit-level Promotion & Tenure Committees to provide assistance on internal PERO evaluation.

8. Those conducting departmental reviews of research must have access to work samples for review, selected by the candidate for promotion as for external referees. Evaluators should then review two or more publications or creative works for their quality of execution, the significance of the topics, and their impact on their field. Materials already reviewed in service of previous promotions should be excluded from review.
9. The evaluation of future potential is often best conducted by the same person doing the evaluation of research. Basis for evaluation should again be stated here. In reviewing a candidate's strategy for future work, for example, an evaluator might consult the candidate's statement of research goals and accomplishments. The evaluation of future potential for PERO cases could refer to the mission and goals of the University, College, and/or unit for public engagement, including addressing the trajectories, timelines, and objectives for the candidate under PERO evaluation.
10. Those conducting departmental reviews of teaching should clearly state their basis and methods of evaluation. ICES scores should form part of that basis, as should classroom visits. For the latter, at least two are desirable and can be performed by the evaluator or by others in consultation with the Unit Executive Officer or otherwise designated coordinator for the review process. Candidates for promotion should be notified in advance of classroom visits, ideally through a consultative process that identifies ideal days for affording a view of the work. Those visiting classes as evaluators should be supplied with course materials ahead of time.
11. Departmental evaluation of teaching can also rely on other bases, including evaluation of student work, measured through explicitly stated criteria, including external recognition of work by students or alumni. It is always important to describe the bases for evaluation, especially in areas where instruction happens less formally, as in the performing arts.
12. Departmental evaluation of service should be based on the candidate's record of accomplishments, with attention to service at the unit, college, campus, and community levels, including service to the discipline. Evaluations should clearly state service expectations for the appointment at hand.
13. Units are welcome to share drafts of internal evaluation narratives with the dean's office for feedback.

V. Voting Procedures for Unit and College Promotion and Tenure Committees

1. Promotion and Tenure Committees should conduct a closed meeting to discuss candidates' qualifications for tenure and/or promotion. These deliberations should focus solely on the cases as presented in the dossier. A secret ballot vote on each candidate's application must be taken at the meeting to determine the committee's final recommendation to the unit executive officer or dean. The result of the final vote must be announced to the committee.

2. The dean(s) or unit executive officer(s) responsible for the process may attend these meetings at the discretion of the unit's faculty, as determined through policy. Though they should not play a role in the committee's evaluation of cases, it is often helpful for such officers to be present for deliberation, in the interest of representing cases for subsequent review by college or campus committees.
3. In discussion of PERO cases, a PERO Advisory Committee member will attend both the Unit-level Promotion & Tenure committee meeting and the College-level Promotion & Tenure committee meetings to advise members during the discussion of a candidate's dossier and MOU.
4. The college Promotion and Tenure Committee follows a practice long in place at the campus level in which committee members do not attend committee discussions on cases from their own units. Neither do they vote on these cases.
5. The voting options are present and voting, or absent but submitting a written vote prior to the meeting. Ballot choices are one of the following: yes, the candidate is deserving of tenure (or promotion); no, the candidate is not deserving of tenure (or promotion); or refusal. Abstaining should not be an option.
6. Members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee should recuse themselves from deliberation and voting only in cases where the member stands to clearly benefit from the successful promotion of the candidate. (Typical examples include co-authorship or collaboration on research, creative, or sponsored work.)
7. Unit executive officers do not vote on cases. Any faculty member who casts an official vote on the candidate at unit level must excuse themselves from voting on a same case at the higher level.
8. If an eligible voting faculty member cannot attend the vote but has participated in deliberations and intends to vote on the candidate's application, that faculty member is responsible for sending the vote in writing in advance of the meeting to a designated staff member who will hold the vote in secret until the time of ballot counting. Vote counting should not begin until all ballots of all faculty members in attendance and all votes from absent and voting faculty members are submitted to the meeting chair.
9. A secret straw poll is recommended as a first step prior to a final vote. When results are mixed, the straw poll offers another opportunity to discuss differences and provide clarifications that may help solidify the final vote.
10. Unanimous votes present the clearest cases for support or denial of promotion or tenure. In cases where there is clear disagreement on the merits of a case among committee members resulting in a split vote, committees should pursue clarity about the reasons for differing conclusions. In the case of split votes, the committee should be very clear about the reasons behind the different conclusions reached and communicate them to the unit executive officer.
11. Recommendations of the Promotion and Tenure Committees are advisory to the dean or unit executive officer.
12. Following the practice of the campus Promotion and Tenure Committee, the college committee may request additional information from unit executive officers in evaluation of cases.

VI. Third-Year Reviews

The third-year review process is a year-long effort that concludes in a letter, presented to the faculty candidate in the context of a meeting with the unit executive officer. The letter itself constitutes the review; the meeting serves as a means to communicate and contextualize the letter's contents.

In accordance with Provost's Communication No. 13, the third-year review letter should provide:

- a clear description of the faculty member's achievements in research, teaching, and service.
- a careful evaluation of these achievements in light of future application for tenure
- precise recommendations for future work.
- In PERO cases, the letter should refer to and acknowledge future work as outlined in the candidate's MOU.

Individual units may bring their own processes to achieving this end and should involve multiple faculty in composing the review letter through evaluation of teaching, research, and service. Evaluation of teaching should involve classroom visits, which are best begun in the fall semester in consultation with the candidate.

Candidates undergoing review should prepare, in service of their third-year review, a draft of their tenure dossier that follows Communication No. 9 format and the college template (Appendix B), including draft self-evaluations of research and teaching. The unit should then provide this dossier, along with a draft of the review letter, to the dean's office.

The college Promotion and Tenure Committee will then assess whether the draft review letter accurately describes the candidate's achievements in research, teaching, and service; correctly evaluates these achievements in light of progress toward tenure; and clearly advises the candidate on necessary steps. In PERO cases, the College P&T committee will also assess the MOU as part of the candidate's next steps for research. A PERO Advisory Committee member can be available to advise this discussion.

Based on a collective discussion, the committee will provide comments and feedback to the unit executive officer through the dean's office. The unit executive officer then revises as appropriate and submits a final draft to the dean for review. Once the dean has approved the letter, the unit executive officer meets with the candidate to review and discuss the letter, resulting in a signature to indicate receipt.

In accordance with Provost's Communication No. 13, these reviews should be conducted with criteria for indefinite tenure in mind, referring to unit guidelines for achieving impact wherever possible. In cases where progress toward successful application for tenure is unclear, a mandatory fourth-year review may be established, wherein, as with the third-year review, a notice of non-reappointment is one possible outcome.

VII. Promotion Processes for Specialized Faculty

Campus guidance on promotion for Specialized Faculty can be found in Provost's Communication No. 26. The following should guide interpretation and application of campus policy.

A. Timeline and Preparation of Materials

1. Each year, academic units determine which specialized faculty members should be considered for promotion. Annual review meetings are an appropriate time to discuss whether and/or when a promotional review should occur.
2. Evaluation of Specialized Faculty for promotion follow a shorter calendar and slightly different deadlines compared to tenure-system faculty. Promotion evaluations for specialized faculty members typically start in the Fall semester, with commencement of the internal review procedures and identification of external reviewers. Cases that progress are reviewed by the College P&T committee at the Spring meeting.
3. Specialized Faculty should make use of the College template for the dossier, listing "not applicable" for areas not relevant to their appointment or their work. Candidates and units should use section V. "Research" for description and evaluation of the candidate's efforts to achieve external impact and influence for either the teaching, research, or professional/clinical aspects of their work, as appropriate to the appointment.

B. Selection of External Reviewers for Promotion of Clinical, Teaching, and Research Faculty

1. Departments and Schools should submit a draft list of referees to the College for advice and review.
2. Each case should include no less than three letters from external referees, with the majority being selected by the Unit, rather than the candidate. See Communication 26 for details regarding selection process, qualifications of external reviewers, etc.
3. External reviewers should come from comparable institutions, and chosen for their ability to speak to the specific criteria for promotion of Specialized Faculty.
4. Letters requesting external evaluation should explain in detail the candidate's specific duties, appointment percentages, and title, as well as campus standards for specialized faculty promotion. Letters must define the role of specialized faculty as appointments focused on a particular area: teaching, research, or clinical. Units should review section VI of Communication 26 for examples and guidelines.

C. Promotion of Lecturers

1. Provost's Communication #25 describes criteria and expectations for appointment to the title of Senior Lecturer. Review for such an appointment requires approval by the unit and the Dean, but does not require review by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.
2. Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer should be able to demonstrate consistent, prolonged and positive impact on students through teaching and a record of

formative contribution to the content and delivery of courses for the academic unit. Review for promotion will be based on student teaching evaluations, classroom visits by tenured faculty, and documentation of course innovation as demonstrated through syllabi, student work, sample assignments, or other associated materials.

Appendix A: Timeline of Events for Promotion and Tenure Review

Tenure and Promotion processes in the college will adhere to the following schedule of events. The dates indicated are approximate—the dean’s office will provide more specific dates for these at the start of each academic year.

[see timeline link on the FAA Promotion and Tenure page for more information]

Appendix B: Dossier Preparation Guidelines and Template

Please adhere to the following guidelines when adding information to the Communication No. 9 template.

1. You may add subheadings below those offered by Provost's Communication No. 9 but you may not extend any of the subheading series at the same level as those provided by the Provost's template. Be sparing in adding new subheadings.

For example, because section II of Comm. 9 ends at "M. Other," we may not invent subsections N, O, P, etc. However, because no subsection of II includes required sub-subheadings (Comm. 9 designates no II.M.1, II.M.2, etc.), we may invent new sub-subheadings, as in II.L.a. "Refereed Conference Presentations Prior to Initial Appointment."

2. No subheadings specified in Provost's Communication No. 9 may be omitted. Instead, subheadings for which a candidate has no items to list should indicate "None" or "Not Applicable" as appropriate.
3. FAA template subheadings that do not exist in the Provost's template may be omitted, amended, or consolidated as needed.
4. All items under section II should be numbered, and numbering should start anew for each subheading. No other items in the dossier should be numbered.
5. Use special characters such as # and + only in section II of the dossier.
6. Include no active hyperlinks in the dossier, and list no URLs that require a login. For URLs, if the address is complicated and long, consider using the "Short URL" tool at illinois.edu/toolbox.
7. "UI" is not a recognized abbreviation for the University of Illinois. The Urbana campus should be referred to as "University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign," "Illinois," or "U of I." "University of Illinois" refers to the system of three campuses.
8. End each entry with a period.
9. Attach a completed checklist to the dossier, prior to numbered sheets, as shown in Provost's Communication No. 9, Attachment 1.
10. When a candidate's creative work takes the form of a few large projects with products under multiple sections of the document, creative subheadings can help eliminate confusion for readers. Consult with the dean's office, and consider, for example, breaking down sections according to project.

11. For candidate's dossiers reviewed under PERO, there may be new subheadings needed to clarify the alternative products in a clear way for readers. Consult with the Dean's office and/or PERO Advisory Committee to identify potential subheadings that may apply.
- 12.
13. For performances, lectures, panels, and talks, list the actual date in addition to the month and year.
14. Indicate page numbers for all journal articles, chapters in books, and reviews.
15. Submit the dossier as an editable e.g. .docx at all stages of the process.
16. Online publication or presentation that does not fulfill a primarily academic or disciplinary purpose, and that does not fulfill a candidate's MOU under PERO—i.e., has not undergone review, or does not reflect a process of research—in most cases should be listed under IV. "Service" rather than II. "Publications and Creative Works."
17. Do not use any of Microsoft Word's automatic formatting for outlines or numbering.
18. Under I.H. "Grants," list external grants under a new subheading I.H.1 "External Grants." Only include competitive grants for which there is a creative or research investigation. Grants in support of teaching, service, engagement, events, or the hosting of visitors should be listed under Service. Fellowships or other stipend-bearing awards should be listed under section I.D. "Honors, Recognitions and Outstanding Achievements." Do not list Scholar's Travel awards. Include internal competitive college- and campus-level grants such as the OVCR Campus Research Board or FAA Creative Research Awards under a new section I.H.2 "Internal Grants." (If there are no external grants, no subheading is needed.)
19. Under I.I. "Review Panels," only list instances where the candidate served outside the university in a scholarly and deliberative capacity in deciding the recipients of awards, grants, or fellowships.
20. Under section III.A.1 "Descriptive Data," do not provide course descriptions. A list of course names and numbers accompanied by the DMI report is sufficient.
21. Under section A.2 & 3 "Supervision of Graduate Students," do not list current positions for former graduate students unless for an academic post or other prestigious appointment.
22. Research statements should focus on description of the scholarly work and associated goals, questions, and advancements. Include succinct examples of recognition to demonstrate success. In PERO cases, discuss the goals, processes, and outcomes of the publicly-engaged research. Discuss the impact and measures of its impact. Refer to the

MOU as needed to explain the research successfully completed and/or its status in terms of completion.

23. Teaching statements should describe the educator's goals for conveying knowledge to students and methods used to achieve these goals. Make statements as specific as possible and illustrate with accounts from actual classroom activity, syllabi, or student work.
24. Take care not to repeat the same item through the dossier.
25. Items not yet completed but firmly secured for the future through a contract may be listed if indicated as such.
26. Applicants for Promotion to Full Professor are advised to include research accomplishments achieved prior to the last promotion in their own subsection listed as such, as in the Provost's template.

[see template link on the FAA Promotion and Tenure page for more information]