

**DEPARTMENT OF POLISH, RUSSIAN AND LITHUANIAN STUDIES (PRLS)
PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA
FOR PROMOTION, TENURE,
AND MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW**

APPROVED BY THE FACULTY OF POLISH RUSSIAN AND LITHUANIAN STUDIES
AUGUST, 30, 2011

Revised by the Faculty of PRLS, April, 25, 2019
Department name change effective August 16, 2019

I. Introduction

Departmental procedures and criteria for promotion and tenure must follow the UIC Promotion and Tenure Guidelines issued each year by the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Departmental Procedures and Criteria shall conform in all particulars to those of the University.

The procedures and criteria for determining recommendations of Promotion, Tenure and Non-Retention in the Department of PRLS are based on the Statutes of the University of Illinois, Article IX, Section 3e:

“In determining appointment to, and salaries and promotion of academic staff, special consideration shall be given to the following: (1) teaching ability and performance; (2) research ability and achievement; and (3) ability and performance in continuing education, public service, committee work, and special assignments designed to promote the quality and effectiveness of academic programs and services.”

Paragraphs II – V detail the procedures for promotion and tenure.

Paragraph VI articulates the procedures for third-year reviews.

II. Materials to be submitted by candidate for promotion.

Faculty members with being considered for promotion must submit to the department head the following materials:

- a) Completed Promotion and Papers as currently issued by the Office of the Provost for Faculty Affairs. These papers include a submission of the materials listed in the curriculum vitae following the categories stipulated by the University, a summary of student evaluations, as well as the research, teaching, service, and interdisciplinary research statements.
- b) Current Curriculum Vitae

- c) Copies of off prints of published materials.
- d) Typescripts of work accepted for publication accompanied by letters of acceptance.
- e) Typescripts of work submitted for publication

III. Research, Creative and other Scholarly Ability and Achievement

1. In evaluating a candidate's research, the Head should obtain a written evaluation from no fewer than five and no more than eight members of the profession or discipline who have not had a close association with the candidate. All letters received in response to a solicitation from the Head must be included in the candidate's file, however, even if the total exceeds the recommended one. In every respect, the handling of these letters must conform to the University's P & T guidelines.
2. In accordance with current University's P & T guidelines, the external referees should be chosen by a person other than the candidate and senior to him or her. The candidate can only suggest a list of names that should not be considered objective referees; the Head is not compelled to follow this suggestion. Each referee should be an acknowledged authority in his or her field and should hold the rank of Full or Associate Professor. It is recommended that the Head seek advice from eligible faculty members within the department in the candidate's field when composing a list of referees.
3. The solicitation of the letters of evaluation should come from the department Head; never from the candidate. It should be clear that the purpose of the letter is not to request an overall evaluation of the candidate's suitability for promotion, but rather, to obtain a candid assessment of the candidate's research accomplishments and standing in the field. Letters should indicate the rank for which the candidate is being considered and whether or not the award of tenure is involved. The tone of the letter should be neutral and should not include requests of a tendentious nature which indicate the desired outcome of the process. Letters must be written in conformity to current University P & T guidelines.
4. Based on the Supreme Court decision in the University of Pennsylvania case as well as recent court decisions involving discrimination claims by faculty who have been denied promotion and/or tenure, letters soliciting external reviews should state that the University shall maintain confidentiality, subject only to involuntary disclosure in legal proceedings.
5. All candidates will have access to the prepared promotion papers with the exception of external letters of evaluation and the Head's final recommendation. As stipulated by University P & T guidelines, the candidate will sign off on the

prepared promotion papers once it is agreed that all materials have been included and have been accurately categorized.

IV. Teaching Ability, Curriculum Development and Performance

1. The Department will carry out a uniform objective student evaluation of all members of the teaching staff on a regular basis.
2. The candidate shall furnish all relevant information on the teaching record and is expected to release all his/her student evaluations at least for the previous four semesters.
3. Peer reports specific to the promotion and tenure process must be performed. The Head will appoint no fewer than two professors to observe classes of the candidate and each will be asked to write a summative report. The candidate has the right to respond in writing to such reports. In addition, the candidate has the right to request additional observations which do not have to be performed by the same peers.

V. Service Record

The candidate should furnish all relevant information on service at various levels: (a) departmental, (b) university, (c) non-university professional services, including learned societies and journals, etc., (d) external professional services.

VI. General Guidelines for Promotion to Associate and Full

A. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

The Department looks for evidence that the applicant is developing as a publishing scholar, an effective teacher, and an active university colleague and member of the academic community. A strong candidate will compile a record of steady productivity over a period of time and give evidence of a coherent research program. The following stands for what the department considers as a strong and convincing case in the areas of research, teaching, and service and suggests some of the ways in which a record of high quality in these three areas can be demonstrated and documented.

Research

The centerpiece in a tenure case for an Assistant Professor should be the publication of a scholarly monograph in the candidate's field of expertise. The monograph can be a substantially revised version of their dissertation or a monograph on a new topic. The press that publishes this book should have a rigorous peer-review process and an established reputation in scholarly publishing. Polish, Russian,

Lithuanian and other non-US presses are appropriate venues for publication, and it should be noted that the review process may be different from that practiced in the U.S.

The Department also looks for evidence that the candidate has engaged in scholarly activity that is not confined to the revision of all, or part, of her/his dissertation. Such evidence includes, but is not limited to, publication of refereed articles in scholarly journals, chapters in scholarly books, edited books and special issues of scholarly journals, and review essays as well as conference papers, lectures, and the development of scholarly websites and other electronic media of scholarly communication. There should be evidence that a second major research project is being developed and may even be in progress. The P & T papers submitted by the Department require a statement written by the candidate describing current and future research. Publications and other research activities of the candidate beyond the dissertation lend credibility to these plans by offering an indication that the Assistant Professor is moving forward on a viable scholarly path. The candidate should also be developing professional standing in his/her branch of the field. Evidence for such development includes, but is not limited to, book reviews; refereeing for publishing houses, for journals, and for award-granting agencies; involvement in the management or editing of a scholarly journal; and participation at professional conferences.

To recommend promotion, the Department needs to be satisfied that the candidate has made a significant contribution to knowledge within the discipline. The candidate's scholarly record is evaluated by the tenured faculty of the Department. Also helping to demonstrate the candidate's achievements in research are evidence of scholarly discussion, citation, and review of the candidate's work, as well as fellowships and prizes awarded internally and externally and grants that have been obtained.

Teaching

The Department expects its faculty members to demonstrate excellence in teaching by means of such evidence as the following: student evaluations, written reports from class visits by colleagues, teaching materials prepared for specific courses, the development of new courses or new topics in existing courses, a record of effective innovation in teaching methods and course design, evidence of specific and effective efforts to improve teaching, proven ability to teach a range of courses, contribution to the development or revision of the Department's curriculum, receipt of one or more of the several campus teaching awards.

The teaching record includes not only courses taught at the undergraduate and graduate levels, but also membership on dissertation committees, participation in comprehensive and preliminary examinations, and student advising. Development of new courses or new topics in courses, other kinds of teaching innovations, and publications on pedagogy are also relevant to the teaching record.

Service

Although less service is expected of junior faculty than of senior colleagues, all faculty members are expected to accept and to discharge effectively routine assignments to committee work, the advising of students, and other non-teaching duties essential to the operation of the Department. Service may also include participation on committees within the university, extra-curricular student support and advising, and active participation in professional organizations. Community involvement that is relevant to the candidate's expertise, as well as lectures for non-professional audiences, enhance the service record. In evaluating the service of candidates who are hired with explicit service expectations, due weight will be given to the extent to which those service expectations are fulfilled.

B. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to full professor may be expected after presentation to the Committee (composed of all full professors) of compelling evidence of substantial scholarly achievement since the candidate's last promotion.

Research

The single most compelling evidence of such substantial scholarly achievement is a book-length monograph in press or published by a reputable university or other scholarly press that has a rigorous review process. It is not normally expected that published scholarly reviews of the book will be available for the Committee's consideration, but if they are available, they should be submitted as well. Polish, Russian, Lithuanian, and other non-US presses are appropriate venues for publication, and it should be noted that the review process may be different from that practiced in the U.S. It is expected that the published book substantially differ from the previously published volume in terms of material, scope, and bibliography. In addition to the published book, the Committee expects to receive evidence of national and international scholarly achievement in any or all of these forms: articles published in scholarly journals; chapters published in edited scholarly collections; scholarly collections edited; outside research grants and fellowships received. The candidate should also have achieved professional standing in his/her branch of the field. Evidence for such development includes, but is not limited to, book reviews; refereeing for publishing houses, for journals, and for award-granting agencies; involvement in the management or editing of a scholarly journal; and leadership or organizational roles at professional associations.

Teaching

It is expected that the teaching performance of the candidate for promotion meet or exceed applicable UIC, LAS and Departmental standards. The Department expects its faculty members to demonstrate excellence in teaching by means of such

evidence as the following: student evaluation, written reports from class visits by colleagues at the same or above rank, teaching materials prepared for specific courses, the development of new courses or new topics in existing courses, a record of effective innovation in teaching methods and course design, evidence of specific and effective efforts to improve teaching, proven ability to teach a range of courses, contribution to the development or revision of the Department's curriculum, receipt of one or more of the several campus teaching awards

The teaching record includes not only courses taught at the undergraduate and graduate levels, but also membership on dissertation committees, participation in comprehensive and preliminary examinations, and student advising. Development of new courses or new topics in courses, other kinds of teaching innovations, and publications on pedagogy are also relevant to the teaching record.

Service

With respect to service, the Committee expects to receive evidence of the candidate's active participation in Departmental, LAS and University committees and/or administration. Evidence of off-campus public service, in the form of speaking, publishing, or other activities that draw on the candidate's status and expertise as a member of the faculty of UIC is also considered here. Evidence of engagement and service in the profession at large is also expected.

C. The Voting Procedure

1. Only faculty at ranks above the current rank of the candidate may vote at any level in the promotion and tenure process. Ranks are defined as in University Statutes: Full professor > Associate professor > Assistant professor > Full clinical Professor > Associate clinical professor > Assistant clinical professor. Only faculty with a 50% appointment or above may vote in tenure and promotion cases.
2. Faculty who are not present for discussion of the case may not vote, except in extraordinary circumstances approved by the Head.
3. The Head of the department shall appoint an ad hoc Promotion and Tenure committee to examine in detail the candidate's record in research, teaching, and service. The chair of the committee, in conjunction with fellow committee members, will be in charge of presenting the merits of the case to eligible faculty members in a special meeting where a secret ballot vote is cast.
4. If there are fewer than three eligible voters in the Department, the Dean, with appropriate advice, may include faculty from other UIC units who are qualified by expertise and who meet all other eligibility standards.

5. The Head of the department may not vote on promotion and tenure cases in the committee review process. His/Her role is to take the votes of the committee under advisement and to make independent recommendations that accompany the promotion and tenure forms.
6. Associate Professors will submit their Curriculum Vitae to the Head of the department when they deem their file merits consideration for promotion to full. The Head of the department will call a meeting of full professors in the department who will advise the Head on the merits of the request and will issue a recommendation as to whether to proceed with the process or wait for further evidence.
7. Assistant Professors will undergo the tenure process when they reach Tenure Code 6 as per their contract and any amendments made to the same.

VII. Mid-Probationary Review Procedures

1. Campus policy requires that a formal, internal review of faculty on probationary contract take place no later than the mid-point of a faculty member's probationary period on the tenure track at UIC.

The primary purpose of a mid-probationary review is faculty development. At the same time however, the review should be understood as having very real consequences for subsequent decisions. Assuming that the candidate meets expectations for continuance in the fourth year and beyond, the mid-probationary review should provide candid guidance to that person as he or she seeks to prepare for the promotion and tenure review.

2. Departmental procedures and criteria for the Mid-Probationary Review must follow UIC Mid-Probationary Review Guidelines issued each year by the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Departmental Procedures and Criteria shall conform in all particulars to those of the University.
3. The Mid-Probationary Review Committee is appointed by the department Head. The committee should consist of no less than three tenured faculty at the associate and full professor ranks. At least two members should be in the candidate's general field.
4. Joint Appointments: In the case of joint appointments each department must conduct its own complete mid-probationary review. Each executive officer must submit her or his own statement, regardless of the percentage appointment.
5. Review Procedures:

- a) Faculty members with Tenure Code 3 (or as specifically indicated in the candidate's letter of appointment) should submit to the department the following materials:
1. Current Curriculum Vitae
 2. Completed Promotion and Tenure Papers as currently issued by the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. These papers include a submission of the materials listed in the curriculum vitae following the categories stipulated by the University, a summary of student evaluations, as well as the research, teaching, service, and interdisciplinary research statements. These Promotion and Tenure Papers will be guide the Mid-Probationary Review Committee in its own assessment of the candidate's progress and will be for internal departmental/committee use only.
 3. Copies of offprints of published materials.
 4. Typescripts of work accepted for publication accompanied by letters of acceptance.
 5. Typescripts of work submitted for publication.
- b) No fewer than two tenured members of the department shall conduct peer observations of two courses and each will be asked to write a summative report which will be offered to the Mid-Probationary Review Committee for examination and placed in the departmental personnel file.
- c) Following College recommendations, letters from external reviewers will not be solicited for the Mid-Probationary Review.
- d) The Mid-Probationary Review Committee will generally consider the following question: "Is the candidate progressing satisfactorily in all areas toward the goal of tenure and promotion?"

A thorough written review of the candidate's progress, and the outcome of that review, will be placed in departmental files and a copy given to the faculty member under review. That individual is then given an opportunity to comment orally and/or in writing, and any written comments will be made part of the departmental personnel file. The faculty member must endorse that he/she has received and read a copy of the evaluation.

- e) The Head will then make a recommendation to the Dean in the form of a written report. This report will be placed in departmental file and a copy will be given to the faculty member under review. That individual is then given an opportunity to comment orally or in writing, and any written comments will be made part of the departmental personnel file. The faculty member must endorse that he/she has received and read a copy of the evaluation.
- f) The Dean will decide whether or not to renew the contract and the probationary faculty must be informed of this recommendation. A copy of the written evaluation signed by the Dean of the respective college and the faculty member's signature and written response, if any, (or a brief summary of these), must be forwarded to the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. A recommendation for a termination contract, if warranted, will be submitted by the Provost on the recommendation of FAHR and VPFA for the Board of Trustees approval. A copy of the full review and the faculty member's response, if any, shall be kept on file in the college office.

6. Review Period:

The mid-probationary review must be completed in sufficient time to meet the deadline set by the college in the Spring semester of the review year.

7. Disposition of the Review:

- a) The final copy of the mid-probationary review must be placed in the department file and a copy given to the faculty member under review.
- b) Mid-probationary reviews must be included in all tenure and promotion files.
- c) An electronic copy of the review must also be maintained.

VIII. Lecturer to Senior Lecturer Promotion¹

1. Promotion in the Non-Tenure Lecturer track procedures follow those of the College: (paste link here; not yet available). For the promotion to Senior Lecturer, candidates need to inform the department head about their interest in being promoted as early as possible to ensure that annual reviews and required observations are completed. As per LAS guidelines lecturers become eligible to be considered for promotion after 3.5 academic years of 100% appointment as a lecturer occurring within a five-year span.
 - a. Annual Review: Lecturers who wish to be promoted will be reviewed annually by a standing or an ad hoc committee of at least three members at the senior lecturer level or above and with at least one tenure-line faculty member. If the lecturer works in a coordinated program under a Language Program Director or course coordinator, the Director or course coordinator should be a member of the committee. The annual review should minimally be based on SIT evaluations and the teaching observations. The candidate should provide the committee with the required information. The candidate should be informed about the outcome of the review in writing before the semester ends.
 - b. Observations: Lecturers who wish to be promoted should be observed at least three times during the first two years of teaching, and at least once a year thereafter. Observations can be conducted by members of the department at the senior lecturer level and above (senior lecturers, clinical, and tenure-line faculty). The teaching observation schedule is arranged by the department head, who ensures that at least one observation has to be completed by a tenure-line faculty member. If it is reasonable, observations can be done across departments within the School. Observations should follow the observation template of the School and should be shared with the candidate within four weeks from the date of performance. The candidate has the right to respond to the teaching observation in writing. The response should be submitted directly to the department head not later than in 4 weeks.
2. Promotion process: At the end of the Fall semester the department head appoints a committee of at least three people to review the candidate's dossier and decide whether the candidate has fulfilled all requirements for promotion. At least one of the members must be tenure-line faculty and the committee can include lecturers, who have worked full time at UIC for more than five years, senior lecturers and clinical faculty. If the lecturer has worked in a coordinated program under a Language Program Director or course coordinator, the Director or course coordinator should be a member of the committee.

¹ Section amended to the original guidelines by a vote of 5-0 on **March 9, 2015**.

3. The candidate is responsible for providing all required materials for the promotion packet as well as an evaluation portfolio to demonstrate excellence in teaching (items 4 and 7 outlined in the LAS guidelines). All materials need to be submitted to the committee by the end of the first week of classes in the Spring semester. In addition to the portfolio items outlined by LAS, materials could include and are not limited to: unsolicited emails from students, evidence of student participation in the School's In/Between poster session and UIC's research forum, lecturer participation in teaching related workshops and conferences both at the UIC and outside, outreach efforts, prove of any on-campus activity, and the organization of and participation in extracurricular activities for students.
4. Voting Procedure: All senior lecturers, clinical and tenure-line faculty in the department are eligible to vote.
 - a. All voting members will consider the following criteria for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer based on excellence in teaching: 1. Teaching Awards. 2. Students evaluations. 3. Unsolicited students' letters. 4. Peer reviews. 5. Intradepartmental activities. Extensive research is not among those criteria but it is thoroughly examined if needed.
 - b. All materials that are part of the promotion package should be made available to voting members two weeks prior to the vote.
 - c. In order to vote members must be physically present in the room or on Skype.
 - d. The candidate must be notified of the outcome of the vote within one week. If the vote is positive the department head will add a letter of endorsement to the packet and forward it to the Director of the School. If the Director supports the promotion he or she will add a letter of endorsement and forward the materials to LAS for review.