

Department of Classics & Mediterranean Studies

Procedures and Criteria for Promotion, Tenure, and Non-retention

(Adopted, 30 April 2010; Amended, 12 February 2015; Revised, November 13, 2020)

INTRODUCTION

In the Department of Classics and Mediterranean Studies, all personnel action involving promotion, tenure, and non-retention follows the procedures laid down in the University Statutes, esp. Article IX, Sections 1, 3, 4, and Article X, Section 1, and conforms with the procedures and policies established by the Office of Academic Affairs and by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

PROCEDURES

1. The Head has the ultimate responsibility for managing cases for Promotion and Tenure: for soliciting letters from outside referees; for advising the candidate about the preparation of the relevant paperwork; and for ensuring that all promotion and tenure papers are prepared in accordance with the guidelines provided by the campus and College. The Head may appoint members of the tenured faculty to assist in the preparation of papers for promotion or tenure. However, the Head is the only person who should communicate with the candidate on matters relating to the case such as votes at each level. Whether the outcome of votes at levels above the Department is revealed to the Department's P&T Committee will be at the candidate's discretion.

2. P&T Committee

Composition: The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of all tenured members of the Department, whose voting members are defined by Article I of the departmental By-Laws as those having a "40% or greater appointment," plus at least one faculty member from one other subunit of the School of Literatures, Cultural Studies, and Linguistics (as per Article II, section 3 of the School By-Laws). The appointment of this additional member will be made by the Director of the School, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the School. Moreover, if the membership of the P&T Committee constituted as described above is fewer than five, the Director, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the School, shall select additional members to bring the total up to a minimum of 5.

Voting: The Head chairs this Committee but does not vote, and members of the Committee do not vote in promotion, tenure, or non-retention cases of persons of their own rank or above, nor do they participate in any evaluative discussion of academic performance or progress toward the promotion of such persons. Members on leave are to notify the Head in writing, at the beginning of their leave, as to whether or not they wish to vote on a case. All members who wish to vote must participate actively in all proceedings of the Committee physically or through teleconference. Voting in all stages of Promotion and Tenure cases will be conducted by secret ballot, either physically or electronically.

This Committee's vote shall be recorded as the departmental vote for the purposes of the process of Promotion and Tenure. The Committee should exclude anyone with a conflict of interest concerning the candidate, with all questions regarding a conflict of interest being directed to the College and/or the Provost.

3. A tenure-track, Assistant Professor wishing to be considered for early promotion, or an Associate Professor wishing to be considered for promotion to Full, shall submit to the Head a petition in writing, explaining the reasons for the request. This petition will be brought by the Head before the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and if the Committee votes to proceed, a case will be set in motion.

4. Requests from a tenure-track Assistant Professor for an interruption of the probationary period are to be made to the Head for transmittal to the Dean.

5. A member of the Clinical Faculty or Faculty at the rank of Lecturer wishing to be considered for promotion shall submit to the Head a petition in writing, explaining the reasons for the request. This petition will be brought by the Head before the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and if the Committee votes to proceed, a case will be set in motion.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH INDEFINITE TENURE

Because tenure is about the future as well as the past, the University and the Department look for evidence that the applicant is developing as a publishing scholar, an effective teacher, and an active university colleague and citizen of the profession. 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 paragraphs are offered as examples of activities that contribute to a strong and convincing case in the areas of research, teaching, and service, and discuss some of the ways in which a record of high quality in these three areas can be demonstrated and documented. The Department looks for a record that meets the standard appropriate to a leading Department in a research university with a national reputation for excellence.

Research

The centerpiece in a tenure case for an Assistant Professor is normally the publication, since the last personnel action, of a scholarly monograph in the candidate's field of expertise. Most Assistant Professors choose to publish a substantially revised version of their dissertation, although this approach is certainly not a requirement. The press that publishes this book should be known for its highly rigorous review process and have an established reputation in scholarly publishing. The scholarly monograph should be published or in production, i.e. not merely submitted/under review, by the time the Promotion and Tenure committee formally begins its deliberations, typically in early Fall semester of the tenure-review year.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee also looks for evidence that the candidate has engaged in scholarly activity that is not confined to the revision of all, or part, of their dissertation. Such evidence includes, but is not limited to, publication of refereed articles in scholarly journals, chapters in scholarly books, edited books, and review essays, as well as conference papers, lectures, and the development of scholarly websites and other electronic media of scholarly communication.

In the absence of a scholarly monograph in production, an Assistant Professor will be considered for tenure if they have, since the last personnel action, published or in production (not in preparation/submitted/under review) a sufficient number – at least 10 or higher – of peer-reviewed articles or chapters of original research, published in scholarly journals or edited volumes, that quantitatively correspond to the research output of a typical monograph.

Hardcopy and electronic publications are equally acceptable in a tenure case, as long as they are of a high scholarly standard. The main questions governing the Promotion Committee's deliberation: Is the work in question scholarly (as distinct from teaching- or service-oriented)? Has it been peer-reviewed? How is it evaluated, as a work of scholarly contribution to a particular field, by the outside referees?

In addition to an already-existing record of publications, as outlined above, there should also 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. Reports from scholars in the candidate's field solicited by the Department are also considered. 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, grants and prizes awarded, especially externally.

Teaching

The Department expects its faculty members to demonstrate excellence in teaching by means of such evidence as the following:

- written reports from class visits by colleagues
- student evaluations (submitted as part of the Student Evaluation of Teaching program)
- unsolicited comments on teaching
- 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

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 in committees within the Department or the University, extra-curricular student support and advising, active participation in professional organizations, or other service to the profession. 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.

Spring Semester of third year:

The University of Illinois at Chicago requires all untenured assistant professors to undergo a “third year/mid-probation review” and the Head is responsible for preparing that review, in keeping with the procedures specified by the Office of Academic Affairs and by the College. The Head shall seek the advice of the Promotion and Tenure Committee concerning the elements comprising the dossier for each Mid-probationary Review. All faculty participating and voting in deliberations concerning a Mid-probationary Review shall, prior to the review, have observed and reported in writing on at least one meeting of a course taught by the candidate. The Head will make a recommendation to the Dean who 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 and by the faculty member, together with the faculty member’s written response, if any, must be forwarded to the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and will become part of the faculty member’s permanent departmental file.

Spring Semester of fifth year:

February - March. All Assistant Professors must come up for promotion by their sixth year and will be asked in the Spring preceding to provide the Promotion and Tenure Committee with all necessary materials. The Committee generates a list of external referees. The candidate may indicate the names of scholars who, because of conflict of interest or because of known hostility or public disagreement, should not be invited to serve as external referees. The candidate, however, has no veto rights over potential external referees; the Department alone reserves the right to select the referees. The candidate is not permitted to see the contents of the external referees’ reports.

Fall Semester of sixth year:

August. Data for the promotion papers are assembled in collaboration with the Head.

September. The Committee meets to consider and vote on the case. If the vote is negative or closely divided, a candidate for early promotion may wish to withdraw at this point. For cases that go forward, the papers are assembled by the Head and the staff, and the Head’s evaluation and recommendation are added, before the package goes to the College.

December. College Executive Committee and Dean discuss and vote on the case.

Spring Semester of sixth year:

March. University Promotion and Tenure Committee discusses and votes on the case, after which it goes to the Provost and then the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees for the final decision. Appeals of this decision are allowed only on procedural grounds.

Assistant Professors are encouraged to consult the website of the Office of Academic Affairs for further information on Promotion and Tenure forms and procedures:

http://www.uic.edu/depts/oa/oaanew/policies_proced.html

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO (FULL) PROFESSOR

1. 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.
2. Normally the single most compelling evidence of such substantial scholarly achievement is a book-length monograph published, since the last personnel action, by a reputable university or other scholarly press. In determining whether a book satisfies this criterion, the Committee considers the scope and contents of the book itself, including its relation to the candidate's previously published work; the reputation of the press in question, including evidence that it subjected the book manuscript to peer review; and the written comments about the book by the 5 to 8 external referees who must be consulted under UIC Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The scholarly monograph should be published or in production, i.e. not merely submitted/under review, by the time the Promotion and Tenure Committee formally begins its deliberations, typically in early Fall Semester of the tenure-review year. It is not normally expected that published scholarly reviews of the book will be available for the Committee's consideration; but if there are available, they should be submitted as well.
3. In addition to the published book as defined in (2) above, the Committee expects to receive evidence of scholarly achievement, since the last personnel action, in any or all of these forms: articles published in peer-reviewed scholarly journals; chapters published in edited, peer-reviewed scholarly collections; scholarly collections edited; receipt of external research grants and fellowships on the candidate's field of scholarly specialization; other evidence of scholarly distinction (e.g. external visiting Professorships; external awards); and book reviews published in scholarly journals. The general rule here is that the more such evidence of supplementary scholarly activity is presented by the candidate, the stronger their case is.

It is also possible, though not normal, that the candidate's record in this respect may be sufficient to obviate the submission to the Committee of the published or in-production monograph specified in (2) above. In that case, an Associate Professor will be considered for promotion if they have, since the last personnel action, published or in production (not in

preparation/submitted/under review) a substantial number – at least 10 or higher – of peer-reviewed articles or chapters of original research, published in scholarly journals or edited volumes, that quantitatively correspond to the research output of a typical monograph.

4. Hardcopy and electronic publications are equally acceptable in a promotion case, as long as they are of a high scholarly standard. The main questions governing the Promotion Committee's deliberation: Is the work in question scholarly (as distinct from teaching- or service-oriented)? Has it been peer-reviewed? How is it evaluated, as a work of scholarly contribution to a particular field, by the 5-8 outside referees? But it should be stressed that "substantial scholarly achievement" normally is demonstrated, for the purposes of promotion to the rank of Full Professor, by scholarly achievement as defined in (2) and (3) above.

5. The Committee also considers, in complementary fashion, the candidate's record, since the last promotion, in teaching and service. It is expected that they would have performed in both respects in a manner that meets or exceeds applicable UIC, LAS and departmental standards. Evidence of such performance should consist, with respect to teaching, of reports from Associate or Full Professors designated to attend the candidate's classes at times mutually agreed upon; of course syllabi and student evaluations (submitted as part of the Student Evaluation of Teaching program); of individual student testimonials, if available (these must be unsolicited); and of the receipt of one or more of the several campus teaching awards. Published textbooks and teaching materials that are published or photocopied may also be considered here. 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 service to the profession or 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. But it should be stressed that "substantial scholarly achievement" as outlined in (2) and (3) constitutes, in the Committee's view, the single most important criterion for promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION IN CLINICAL RANKS

For promotion to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor, candidates will be expected to have experience at the Clinical Assistant Professor rank or equivalent. Candidates will also be expected to demonstrate, since the last personnel action, effective contributions in the area of teaching, including the development of new courses/curricula; to the training or supervision, if applicable, of graders and teaching assistants; to supply evidence of service to one or more of the Department, School, College, University or the profession; and to have made, if applicable, contributions to pedagogical scholarship.

For promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor, candidates will be expected to have experience at the Clinical Associate Professor rank or equivalent. Candidates will also be expected to have made, since the last personnel action, effective contributions in the area of teaching, including the

development of new courses/curricula; to the training or supervision, if applicable, of graders and teaching assistants; to supply evidence of service to one or more of the Department, School, College, University or the profession; and to have made, if applicable, contributions to pedagogical scholarship.

PROMOTION IN THE NON-TENURE LECTURER TRACK

Procedures for promotion in the Non-Tenure Lecturer track follow those of the University (<https://faculty.uic.edu/hr/promotionandtenure/seniorrank/>). 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.

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 peer teaching observations as well as student evaluations (submitted as part of the Student Evaluation of Teaching program). The candidate should provide the Committee with the required information. The candidate should be informed about the outcome of the review in writing.

Peer Teaching Observations

Lecturers who wish to be promoted should be observed at least once per year, as per SLCSL guidelines (<https://lcsl.uic.edu/information-for-faculty-and-staff/peer-observation-guidelines/>), during each academic year prior to achieving eligibility, i.e. for the previous 3.5 years or more before requesting promotion. 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. If it is reasonable, observations can be performed across Departments within the School. Peer teaching observations should be shared with the candidate. The candidate has the right to respond to the teaching observation in writing. The response should be submitted directly to the Department Head.

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.

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 but not limited to: unsolicited emails from students, evidence of participation by students mentored by the candidate in the School's In/Between poster session and UIC's research forum, Lecturer participation in teaching-related workshops (e.g., at the LCLC) and conferences (e.g., Language Symposium), outreach efforts, and the organization of and participation in extracurricular activities for students. Evidence for service and research, although not formally required, may be submitted and will be considered in the candidate's favor.

All Senior Lecturers, Clinical and Tenure-line faculty in the department are eligible to vote. All materials that are part of the promotion package should be made available to voting members two weeks prior to the vote. Voting will be conducted by secret ballot, either physically or electronically. The candidate must be notified of the outcome of the vote within one week.

The Department Head and the Assistant Director of Faculty and Academic Affairs of the School complete all forms required by the College. 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.

Promotion Criteria

The main criterion voting members will consider for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer will be excellence in teaching as demonstrated by: peer teaching observations; internal or external teaching awards; student evaluations (submitted as part of the Student Evaluation of

Teaching program; unsolicited student emails; commitment to departmental development. A reduced, compared to Tenure-line or Clinical faculty, amount of departmental service by Lecturers or Senior Lecturers might be necessary if there are not enough Tenure-line or Clinical faculty to carry out all the administrative duties of the Department (e.g., membership in the Advisory Committee; conducting peer teaching observations). If there is a record of service to the Department, School, College, University, or the profession, it will be taken into consideration in the process of promotion to Senior Lecturer and will count in the candidate's favor. Research is not required for promotion to Senior Lecturer, but if available will be taken into account and in the candidate's favor.