

1 **CHAPTER 3. PROMOTION AND TENURE STANDARDS AND**
2 **PROCEDURES**
3
4 3.1 Overview.....4
5 3.2 Probationary Service.....4
6 3.2.1 Length of Probationary Period4
7 3.2.1.1 Assistant Professors Credit for Prior Service5
8 3.2.1.2 Associate or Full Professors Credit for Prior Service5
9 3.2.1.3 Non-tenure-line Full-Time Appointments.....5
10 3.2.2 Leaves of Absence.....5
11 3.3 Types of Review for Tenure-Line Faculty.....6
12 3.3.1 Probationary Tenure-Line Reviews.....6
13 3.3.1.1 Formal Tenure-line Probationary Reviews6
14 3.3.1.2 Informal Tenure-line Probationary Reviews7
15 3.3.1.3 The Tenure Review.....7
16 3.3.2 Promotion in Rank.....8
17 3.4 Criteria for Promotion and Tenure8
18 3.4.1 Requirements by Rank.....8
19 3.4.2 University-wide Criteria8
20 3.4.2.1 Teaching and Learning.....9
21 3.4.2.2 Scholarship, Research, or Other Creative Activities.....9
22 3.4.2.3 Service.....10
23 3.4.3 Local Academic Unit and College Guidelines.....11
24 3.4.4 Institutional Considerations12
25 3.5 Process for Tenure and Promotion12
26 3.5.1 General Principles.....12
27 3.5.1.1 Common Processes13
28 3.5.1.2 Guidelines Specific to Multi-Unit Appointments.....14
29 3.5.1.3 Guidelines for Evaluating Collaborative Work15
30 3.5.2 Processes Common to All Evaluation Levels15
31 3.5.2.1 Signing Statement.....16

1	3.5.2.2	Minority Report	16
2	3.5.3	Local Academic Unit	17
3	3.5.4	Local Academic Unit Is College	17
4	3.5.4.1	Personnel Committee (optional)	17
5	3.5.4.2	Tenured Faculty of the College	17
6	3.5.4.3	Dean	17
7	3.5.4.4	Candidate Response to College Review.....	18
8	3.5.5	Local Academic Unit Is Not College.....	18
9	3.5.5.1	Local Academic Unit Personnel Committee (Optional)	18
10	3.5.5.2	Tenured Faculty of the Local Academic Unit	18
11	3.5.5.3	Local Unit Academic Officer (Unit Chair or Director)	18
12	3.5.5.4	Candidate Response to Local Academic Unit Review	19
13	3.5.5.5	College-Level Personnel Committee	19
14	3.5.5.6	Dean	19
15	3.5.5.7	Candidate Response to College Review.....	19
16	3.5.6	University Review	20
17	3.5.6.1	University Board on Promotion and Tenure	20
18	3.5.6.2	Candidate Response to UBPT	20
19	3.5.6.3	Provost Decision	20
20	3.5.7	Detailed Procedures	20
21	3.5.7.1	Committees.....	20
22	3.5.7.2	Local Academic Unit (Not College) Personnel Committees	21
23	3.5.7.3	Tenured Faculty of the Local Academic Unit	21
24	3.5.7.4	College Personnel Committees.....	21
25	3.5.7.5	University Board on Promotion and Tenure	22
26	3.6	Materials	22
27	3.6.1	Dossier	22
28	3.6.1.1	Items Supplied By Candidate	22
29	3.6.1.2	Items Supplied By Academic Unit and College.....	23
30	3.6.1.3	Additions to the Dossier.....	23
31	3.6.2	External Letters	24

1 3.6.2.1 Authors of External Letters24
2 3.6.2.2 External Letter Contents.....25
3 3.6.2.3 Confidentiality of External Letters25
4 3.6.2.4 Suggested Sample Letter25
5 3.6.3 Student Input26
6 3.6.3.1 Student Input Instrument.....26
7 3.6.3.2 Evaluation and Submission of Student Input Data27
8 3.7 Appeal.....27
9 3.8 Schedule for Informal and Formal Reviews28
10 3.9 Schedule for Promotion and Tenure.....29
11 3.9.1 University Promotion and Tenure Schedule29
12

CHAPTER 3. PROMOTION AND TENURE STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

3.1 Overview

Faculty members contribute to DePaul University as the primary creators of a vibrant academic community. The university seeks to foster an environment that provides professors with enriching opportunities to guide students, pursue scholarship and creative activities, and advance the institution's well-being.

DePaul honors and rewards faculty members for their professional achievements. It maintains a system of faculty evaluation that relies heavily on the views of faculty. Exercising professional judgment, experienced faculty evaluate the work of their colleagues for renewal, promotion, and tenure.

Tenure is the foundation of academic freedom and the quality of the university. It is neither an end in itself nor a privilege exempting the individual from the obligation to make future contributions. It is, rather, a status that society recognizes as promoting the common good. Before granting tenure, the university should have no reasonable doubt about the faculty member's demonstrated qualifications and continued capacity to contribute to DePaul's distinctive goals and academic mission. Tenure creates the presumption of continuing employment, unless the university, using established procedures and faculty guidance, proves that countervailing circumstances exist.

This chapter sets out DePaul University's standards and procedures for evaluating its tenure-line faculty.

3.2 Probationary Service

The probationary period is defined as the candidate's time of continuous service in full-time tenure track at DePaul, at the end of which the tenure decision is made. During the probationary period, a tenure-line faculty member undergoes annual formal or informal evaluations for contract renewal or nonrenewal. In the final year of probationary service, the faculty member may apply for tenure and promotion. An unsuccessful candidate for tenure will not be offered a contract renewal, but will be offered a terminal contract of one year for the academic year following the academic year in which the faculty member applied for tenure.

3.2.1 *Length of Probationary Period*

The maximum probationary period is six years excluding certain types of leaves that suspend the clock as described in Section 3.2.2. The probationary period may be reduced by agreement based on full-time prior academic service. The initial tenure-line contract must state any agreed-upon credit for prior service.

3.2.1.1 Assistant Professors Credit for Prior Service

A prospective faculty member recruited to DePaul as an assistant professor may have previously held a full-time faculty appointment at another college or university. The length of the probationary period at DePaul may be reduced by one, two, or three years, upon agreement of the individual and the university at the time of appointment. The initial faculty contract must state any agreed-upon credit for prior service.

3.2.1.2 Associate or Full Professors Credit for Prior Service

A prospective faculty member recruited to DePaul as an associate or full professor may receive an appointment without tenure. Upon agreement of the individual and the university at the time of appointment, one, two, three, or four years of prior full-time faculty service at another college or university may be credited to the probationary period at DePaul. The faculty member's initial contract must reflect the agreed-upon amount of credit for prior service and the review schedule. Regardless of the amount of credit, the individual will not be evaluated for tenure without having had at least one formal probationary evaluation at DePaul prior to the tenure evaluation.

3.2.1.3 Non-tenure-line Full-Time Appointments

As a general norm, the years a faculty member has spent at DePaul University in a non-tenure-line full-time appointment (e.g., instructor or visiting professor) do not count toward the probationary period. If a faculty member's status changes to a tenure-line appointment, the individual and the university may agree to credit one or more years of special appointments toward the probationary period. The faculty member's initial contract for a tenure-line full-time appointment must reflect the agreed-upon amount of credit for the prior service at DePaul. Regardless of the amount of credit, the individual will not be evaluated for tenure without having had at least one formal probationary evaluation at DePaul prior to the tenure evaluation.

3.2.2 Leaves of Absence

A leave of one quarter or longer may interrupt the faculty member's probationary period.

If an untenured tenure-line faculty member takes a leave as defined by DePaul policies, including family or medical leave, research leave, teaching leave, or military service leave, the year during which the leave occurs is normally not considered as a year of probationary service, and the leave does not break the required continuity of full-time service. If the candidate, however, wishes for the leave not to affect the length of the probationary period, they must notify the dean in writing within six months upon return from the leave.

Faculty sometimes request and are granted a personal leave that does not fall into any of the categories covered in the prior paragraph. If a candidate takes such a leave, the provost makes the decision on how the leave affects the probationary period. (Section 6.7.)

3.3 Types of Review for Tenure-Line Faculty

3.3.1 Probationary Tenure-Line Reviews

During the probationary period, the probationary tenure-line faculty member will be subject to annual probationary reviews conducted by the faculty member's local academic unit. In colleges with departments, the local academic unit is, in colleges with departments, the department or similar body. In other colleges, it is the lowest-level body conducting reviews for tenure and promotion.

Probationary reviews serve three major purposes:

1. To assess the faculty member's progress toward promotion and/or tenure, measuring the individual against the established criteria
2. To provide clear and consistent guidance and develop priorities for the faculty member toward fully satisfying the criteria, and
3. To recommend for or against renewal.

Three types of probationary reviews apply to tenure-line faculty who are untenured: informal, formal, and the tenure review. Each evaluation leads to a decision for renewal or nonrenewal (see also Section 4.2).

The dean normally makes the decision on annual renewal and nonrenewal and reports it to the local academic unit.

The local academic unit may appeal the dean's decision to the provost. In such cases, the dean and the department or unit provide the provost with written reasons for their respective positions. The provost makes the final decision and reports it to the candidate. A faculty member who is not renewed may file an appeal (Chapter 5).

A formal review must precede a decision in year five to issue a terminal contract. In case of nonrenewal, the candidate is not eligible to apply for tenure or promotion.

3.3.1.1 Formal Tenure-line Probationary Reviews

A formal probationary review is designed to prepare a faculty member for the tenure process and to document areas that need the faculty member's attention. In a formal review, the local academic unit considers the candidate's personal statement and CV, evidence of scholarship or documentation of creative activity, student evaluations, evidence of service, and other materials specified by policies of the local academic unit or college.

Each local academic unit or its personnel committee conducts a formal review of untenured tenure-line faculty no less often than every two years. The tenured faculty of the local academic unit then vote by separate secret ballots on (1) adequate progress toward tenure and (2) renewal. The faculty prepare a report that clearly details areas of strength and areas for improvement. The report is explicit about the faculty member's progress towards tenure. Copies of this report are forwarded to the candidate and the

1 dean. The dean writes a separate letter to the provost with a recommendation regarding renewal or
2 nonrenewal. If a formal review raises serious concerns about the candidate's potential for attaining
3 promotion or tenure, the local academic unit faculty, local academic unit officer, or dean may mandate
4 that the next year's probationary review be formal. The fore-mentioned formal review that raised serious
5 concerns will stipulate a timeline and process for improvement. In subsequent reviews, a faculty
6 member's performance must demonstrate improvement in any area flagged in the prior formal review.
7

8 Most faculty will have two formal reviews: one in their second year and one in their fourth year. The
9 University recognizes that faculty members must have the opportunity to develop strengths and skills as
10 they progress toward tenure. Therefore, adequate progress toward tenure during the first formal review is
11 not necessarily the same as what adequate progress toward tenure means in subsequent formal reviews
12 leading up to and including the tenure review. As a general guideline, the first formal review should
13 reflect early evidence of effective teaching and efforts to establish what will become a notable record of
14 scholarship and service. By the time of the second formal review (typically in the fourth probationary
15 year), the faculty member should demonstrate continued effectiveness in the classroom and notable
16 research and service with improvements in any areas of concern identified in previous reviews. By the
17 tenure review, a faculty member should demonstrate consistently effective teaching performance. The
18 candidate should also show evidence of notable scholarship (research, and/or other creative activities) and
19 service.
20

21 In the event that a faculty member's tenure clock is accelerated due to years credited toward tenure upon
22 hire and the candidate will only have one formal review prior to tenure, the rankings associated with the
23 review should align with a second formal review. The years credited come with an expectation of
24 effective teaching performance, scholarly productivity, and service contributions at a more advanced
25 level.
26

27 **3.3.1.2 Informal Tenure-line Probationary Reviews**

28
29 The purpose of an informal review is to recommend for or against contract renewal and to address
30 progress towards tenure in review periods when a formal review is not conducted.
31

32 In years in which a formal review is not conducted, the chair, dean, or, where applicable, appropriate
33 committee conducts an informal review of the faculty member, according to processes specified in local
34 academic unit or college policies, that results in a written recommendation to the provost, with a copy to
35 the candidate.
36

37 **3.3.1.3 The Tenure Review**

38
39 The tenure review is the final review during the probationary period. It begins with the candidate's tenure
40 application and concludes with the provost's decision to grant or deny tenure. It is a formal review
41 involving university-wide consideration under detailed procedures. It includes solicitation of opinions
42 from external reviewers and from students. The tenure review examines the faculty member's
43 accomplishments and assesses the likelihood of future accomplishments.
44

1 Before granting tenure, the university should have no reasonable doubt about the faculty member's
2 demonstrated qualifications and continued capacity to contribute to DePaul's distinctive goals and
3 academic mission.

4 5 **3.3.2 Promotion in Rank**

6
7 Ordinarily, an assistant professor applies for tenure and promotion simultaneously. The candidate receives
8 either both promotion to associate professor and tenure or neither promotion nor tenure. Only an associate
9 professor may apply for promotion for full professor.

10
11 A faculty member ordinarily serves three to six years in a given rank before promotion. See Section
12 3.5.1.1 (m) for details.

13
14 There is no limit to the number of times a faculty member may apply for promotion to full professor. In
15 the event of a denial of promotion, the faculty member may not re-apply for promotion in the year
16 immediately following the denial.

17 18 **3.4 Criteria for Promotion and Tenure**

19 20 **3.4.1 Requirements by Rank**

21
22 **Assistant Professor.** The doctorate or terminal degree is required for this rank. Exceptions are made for
23 candidates who have already attained recognition for scholarly or other relevant professional
24 achievements and who give promise of continued academic development. The assistant professor should
25 demonstrate a potential for becoming an effective teacher, for pursuing scholarship, research, and/or other
26 creative activities, and for service.

27
28 **Associate Professor.** In addition to the requirements for assistant professor, the candidate must
29 demonstrate consistently effective teaching performance. The candidate should also show evidence of
30 notable scholarship, research, and/or other creative activities, and service. For this rank, the candidate
31 should show significant involvement in service to DePaul at the local academic unit and beyond. This
32 rank is reserved for those with recognized academic achievements.

33
34 **Professor.** In addition to the requirements for associate professor, candidates must give evidence of
35 continued scholarship, research, and/or other creative activities – the quality of which is recognized by
36 their peers inside and outside the university. Candidates for this rank must also show a record of notable
37 service contributions at the university level. Effective teaching remains mandatory for this rank. This
38 rank is reserved for those with recognized academic achievements.

39 40 **3.4.2 University-wide Criteria**

41
42 DePaul University appoints, retains, promotes, tenures, and rewards faculty who best help the university
43 fulfill its mission, as articulated in the university's Mission Statement and Faculty Handbook. The
44 principal criteria for tenure and advancement in academic rank are: teaching and learning; scholarship,

1 research, or other creative activities; and service. In evaluating faculty for promotion or tenure, local
 2 academic units specify more detailed guidelines that provide unit- and discipline-specific articulations of
 3 the university-wide criteria (Section 3.4.3.)

5 **3.4.2.1 Teaching and Learning**

7 Effective teaching is the first requirement in decisions at all levels on appointment, retention, promotion,
 8 and tenure. Teaching evaluation must be done in a systematic, documented manner, including
 9 contributions from the candidate's students and peers. Effective teaching involves:

- 11 • Command of material
- 12 • Effective communication of subject matter
- 13 • Development and articulation of appropriate and thorough learning objectives for each course
 14 taught
- 15 • Delivery of course content that is appropriate to the level of the course, its description in the
 16 course catalog, and its student audience
- 17 • Probing and fair methods of evaluating students
- 18 • Success in bringing students to an acceptable level of performance and in challenging them to
 19 grow intellectually and morally

21 Instructional activities outside the classroom, such as course development (individual or collaborative),
 22 academic advisement, accessibility to students, supervision of independent study, and contributions to
 23 meeting departmental instructional needs, are also relevant.

25 **3.4.2.2 Scholarship, Research, or Other Creative Activities**

27 Throughout their professional lives, all tenure-line faculty members should engage in scholarship,
 28 research, or other creative activities. Each requires disseminating the results of completed projects in
 29 academic and artistic arenas outside DePaul.

31 The university evaluates untenured tenure-line faculty based on their total output of work.

33 Scholarship, while including research, is a broader concept. Research traditionally refers to discovery
 34 using the disciplinary methodologies for investigation and production of new knowledge in the
 35 humanities, social and natural sciences, and mathematics. Research is usually shared through
 36 presentations at professional meetings and academic publications. Scholarship is a broader term
 37 encompassing the four separate but overlapping functions of a quality faculty member: discovery,
 38 integration, application, and teaching.

- 40 • Original discovery advances knowledge within the context of a disciplinary or multi-disciplinary
 41 field and practice, contributing significantly to knowledge and the intellectual life of the
 42 university. Research falls into the category of discovery.
- 43 • Integration develops knowledge through cross- and multi-disciplinary investigations, allowing
 44 new fields of inquiry to develop.

- 1 • The application of knowledge uses research findings in responsible ways to address contemporary
- 2 societal problems through interaction with the larger community.
- 3 • The study of teaching experiences leads to the development of better pedagogical methods and
- 4 tools.

5
 6 Creative activities refer to activities other than scholarship. Creative activities result in products in the
 7 fine arts, such as the visual arts, the literary arts, and the performing arts, and their combinations and
 8 supportive activities. These can also be addressed as objects of scholarship through any of the four
 9 functions listed above.

10
 11 Evidence of research, scholarship, or creative activities should include, at a minimum:

- 12 • A current and complete curriculum vitae
- 13 • Copies of the project results where feasible
- 14 • If applicable, documentation sufficient to substantiate the candidate’s contributions to
- 15 collaborative projects, as specified in the local academic unit guidelines
- 16 • Assessment of the contributions by professional peers and other experts in the field
- 17 • Self-assessment concerning scholarly or creative growth and development

18
 19 The University evaluates research, scholarship, and creative activities in light of their:

- 20 • Originality
- 21 • Contribution to knowledge
- 22 • Conceptual or artistic sophistication
- 23 • Intellectual rigor or artistic skills
- 24 • Effective application of knowledge to address human problems or needs
- 25 • Effective communication of knowledge to audiences beyond the classroom

26
 27 Scholarship or creative activities that cannot be evaluated by these criteria will not be considered for
 28 promotion and tenure. An academic unit may evaluate oral presentations or creative activities by various
 29 means including (but not limited to) listening to recordings, examining drafts, or soliciting the views of
 30 other scholars (including other members of the DePaul faculty) who were in attendance.

31
 32 Activities conducted solely within the candidate's classes, or designed merely to keep a candidate abreast
 33 of scholarly development in a field, are considered in evaluating the candidate's teaching, not in
 34 evaluating their contributions in scholarship, research, or other creative activities.

35 36 **3.4.2.3 Service**

37
 38 Service consists of documented activities that

- 39 • Benefit the university and its academic units, professional associations, the community, or the
- 40 broader public
- 41 • Are consistent with the university's mission
- 42 • Clearly benefit from the expertise of the faculty member -- either the specialized expertise of the
- 43 faculty member's field or the professional skills possessed by all members of the faculty

1
2 Service may be provided to the university, the profession, and the community. The amount and nature of
3 service are correlated with academic rank.

4
5 University service consists of contributions to the enhancement of the institution's internal processes and
6 its relationships with external bodies. All faculty members must serve in their local academic unit (unless
7 assigned to a position such as associate dean that precludes such service).

8
9 Professional service consists of contributions to the organizations or associations of the faculty member's
10 academic discipline or the professoriate. Professional service may have a component of scholarship or
11 creative activities.

12
13 Community service activities contribute to the public welfare outside the institution, consistent with the
14 Vincentian tradition of DePaul University. Activities consistent with a faculty member's expertise but that
15 could be done by someone without that expertise do not qualify as community service. In some instances,
16 it will not be obvious whether an activity counts as community service. In those cases, it is the
17 responsibility of the candidate to make the case demonstrating that the activity qualifies as service as the
18 term is used here.

20 ***3.4.3 Local Academic Unit and College Guidelines***

21
22 Local academic units and colleges have the responsibility to adopt written guidelines and policies for
23 tenure-line faculty evaluation. These guidelines have two purposes: (1) they provide unit- or college-
24 specific articulations of university-wide criteria based on the professional discipline, field, or
25 interdisciplinary area, including collaborative work, as applicable; and (2) they describe unit- or college-
26 specific procedures and processes used for promotion and tenure. The guidelines must be consistent with
27 the university's criteria and procedures specified in this Faculty Handbook. In the absence of approved
28 unit or college guidelines, the guidelines of the higher level will apply.

29
30 The faculty of the local academic unit bear the primary responsibility for developing and amending
31 guidelines. Guidelines should include at least these elements:

32 Criteria

- 33
34
- 35 a) Statement of discipline-specific articulations for university-wide criteria and expectations for
36 teaching, research and creative activities, and service, including guidelines for evaluating
37 effective teaching.
 - 38 b) Specification of standards for different forms of scholarship within the discipline (or
39 interdisciplinary field), including guidelines for evaluating fee-based presentations and
40 publications, where common.
 - 41 c) Statement indicated the disciplinary convention for authorial credit for co-authored work, if one
42 exists. The unit bylaws must specify the standard of practice regarding the co-authorship with
43 students and whether such publication should be primarily categorized as a teaching or research

1 accomplishment. The candidates should also explain the relative contributions of the student(s)
2 to the publication in their statements.

3 4 Process

- 5
6 a) Uniform policies detailing the process used for evaluations
7 b) Composition of the personnel committee, if any
8 c) Policies on remote participation in meetings
9 d) Explanation of participation by, or exclusion of, faculty who are unavailable at the time of the
10 evaluation for reasons such as illness or leaves of absence. (Reviewers allowed to participate
11 must have read the dossier in advance.)
12 e) Guidance on whether reviewers must have attained at least the rank that the candidate seeks
13 f) Process for amending guidelines
14

15 College guidelines should reflect the input of their constituent academic units, where applicable.
16

17 The University Board on Promotion and Tenure reviews changes in the guidelines prepared by local
18 academic units and colleges. The UBPT determines whether the guidelines are clear and consonant with
19 the general university-wide criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure. If the UBPT finds local
20 academic unit or college guidelines to be unclear or inconsistent with university requirements, it will
21 inform the local academic unit or college in writing with the expectation that the guidelines will be
22 revised. In the absence of guidelines or if the guidelines have not been approved by the UBPT, the
23 guidelines of the higher level will be used.
24

25 Approved guidelines included in official documents of academic units are binding, as are the university-
26 wide criteria and processes. Should there be inconsistencies in the guidelines and criteria of different
27 evaluation levels, those of the higher level prevail.
28

29 **3.4.4 Institutional Considerations**

30
31 Merit is not the sole consideration for professional advancement at DePaul University. Institutional need
32 also plays a role in the renewal and tenure of untenured faculty. In planning the number and qualifications
33 of faculty to meet future needs and the resources required to support the faculty, the university may –
34 after consultation with the faculty – limit the number or proportion of tenured positions in the university
35 or in any of its academic units. In such instances, tenure would not be granted regardless of the faculty
36 member’s qualifications and length of service. The university will notify affected faculty members
37 promptly upon the adoption of any such limitation.
38

39 **3.5 Process for Tenure and Promotion**

40 41 **3.5.1 General Principles**

42
43 The following general principles guide promotion and tenure reviews:
44

3.5.1.1 Common Processes

- a) There are normally three levels of evaluation prior to the final decision of the provost: the local academic unit, the college, and the university. In the absence of departmental or school structures, the local academic unit is the college and thus there are only two levels: the local academic unit and the university.
- b) An individual faculty member may vote or advocate for or against a candidate only at one level in the review process. Members of UBPT must vote only on the UBPT. In units where the local academic unit is not the college, college policy must specify whether college personnel committee members vote at the college or the local academic unit level. However, members of a local academic unit personnel committee may fully participate and vote in both the personnel committee's evaluation and the local academic unit evaluation.
- c) All votes are by secret ballot and the numerical results are recorded. A tie vote will be interpreted as a recommendation against renewal or against an award of tenure or promotion.
- d) Candidates receive the written reports and vote counts at each step in the process promptly as those materials become available. Candidates receive external letters with information identifying the reviewer redacted.
- e) Candidates receive copies of any additions to a dossier.
- f) Each level of evaluation is substantive and judges the candidate on the merits according to the university's criteria and the guidelines of that level of review. In addition to substantive review, reviewers after the initial level consider the method and care of application of the approved guidelines by lower-level unit(s) and the disciplinary expertise of the local academic unit. Relevant issues include matters of stringency, consistency among candidates, and fairness, as well as the implications the decision may have at the college, school, or university level.
- g) All individuals participating in the process at any stage must respect its confidentiality. They must not reveal votes, the names or views of referees, the contents of discussions, or the contents of the dossier to anyone. Intentional or continuing breaches of confidentiality are considered to be serious violations of professional ethics. Local academic units and colleges must take appropriate steps to maintain confidentiality, including during the physical preparation of the dossier and dossier storage. It is unwise to make a broad electronic distribution of the dossier; instead password-protected web sites can be used. All documentation will be retained in accordance with the Records Management policy.
- h) Faculty members should always avoid conflicts of interest in evaluating individual faculty members for appointment, renewal, tenure, or promotion. The university expects the provost, deans, local academic unit administrators, and all other internal faculty reviewers to acknowledge such conflicts openly and to abstain from participation whenever conflicts arise.

- 1 i) Faculty members receive tenure only upon affirmative award by DePaul University. Each year,
2 eligible tenure-line faculty may apply for tenure and/or promotion. By April 1, the Office of
3 Academic Affairs will notify eligible faculty in writing of the deadline for submitting an
4 application for promotion and tenure or promotion for the following year. The faculty member
5 must submit their request to the local academic unit officer, academic dean, and the Office of
6 Academic Affairs by the stated deadline, typically May 1.
7
- 8 j) Requests for tenure submitted before the year of eligibility will not be accepted. If a faculty
9 member eligible for tenure consideration fails to apply by the application deadline the faculty
10 member forfeits the opportunity for tenure consideration and receives a terminal contract of no
11 more than one year's duration.
12
- 13 k) Failure to meet the application deadline for promotion to full professor postpones consideration
14 until the next academic year. There is no limit to the number of times a faculty member may
15 apply for promotion to full professor, except that a candidate may not re-apply in the year
16 immediately following a decision denying promotion.
17
- 18 l) The provost will acknowledge receipt of applications for promotion, for tenure, or for promotion
19 and tenure, no later than May 15. For candidates with tenure who are seeking promotion to full
20 professor, the provost will advise all candidates of the right to withdraw an application for
21 promotion at any time, without prejudice to future applications.
22
- 23 m) Faculty members are normally expected to serve a minimum of three to six years, depending on
24 the practice of their college, in a given rank before promotion to the next rank. Exceptions to the
25 norm are allowed only when the dean and, if one exists, college personnel committee, certify that
26 the candidate's extraordinary performance, under departmental, school, and college guidelines,
27 warrants early application for promotion.
28
- 29 n) Candidates may continue through all stages of evaluation, regardless of a negative
30 recommendation at any stage.
31

32 **3.5.1.2 Guidelines Specific to Multi-Unit Appointments**

33

- 34 a) If a faculty member has a formal appointment in more than one academic unit, the home
35 academic unit specified in the appointment letter evaluates the candidate. The second unit
36 evaluates the candidate if it so chooses, or if requested to do so by either the candidate or the
37 home unit. The second unit conducts an independent evaluation and makes a recommendation
38 based on the candidate's responsibilities in that unit. The second unit may review the reference
39 letters and student input from the home academic unit. The report of the second unit will be
40 forwarded to the home unit for its consideration and inclusion in the dossier.
41
- 42 b) A faculty member who changes formal appointments during the period under evaluation shall be
43 evaluated by both academic units. Either unit may, upon request, have access to the other unit's

1 documentation. Each academic unit sends the candidate's supporting documents and the unit's
2 evaluation to the next higher level unit.

- 3
- 4 c) A faculty member with a formal appointment in only one department or local academic unit may
5 have formally assigned duties in one or more other units. In evaluating the faculty member, the
6 home unit shall invite the other units to submit evaluations, which the home unit will include with
7 its evaluation. At each stage in the review process, the evaluations will receive weight in the
8 approximate portion of the workload assignment to each entity. Ultimately, the recommendation
9 to the next level of review rests with the home academic unit.

10

11 **3.5.1.3 Guidelines for Evaluating Collaborative Work**

12

13 Collaborative activities within and across units are valued at DePaul. If collaborative work is submitted as
14 part of the dossier, it must be evaluated as part of tenure and promotion review. Individual contributions
15 to collaborative work should be described specifically by the candidate and documented by team
16 members. Evaluators should consider that collaborative work may be especially labor-intensive, may be
17 disseminated in non-traditional forms, and may blur the conventional distinctions between research and
18 teaching and service. Local Academic Units should specify in their guidelines the processes and policies
19 governing the evaluation and weight of collaborative work in the tenure and promotion review.

20

21 **3.5.2 Processes Common to All Evaluation Levels**

22

23 At all levels of evaluation the following processes must be followed:

- 24
- 25 a) Additions to the dossier may be made in accordance with the guidelines in this chapter.
- 26
- 27 b) The reviewing body's numerical vote must be reported to all subsequent levels.
- 28
- 29 c) All documents considered at each level must be passed on to subsequent levels. The candidate has
30 access to all documents being considered, but the candidate's copies of the external reviewer
31 letters must have the reviewer's identifying information redacted.
- 32
- 33 d) The local academic unit officer (e.g., department chair) or academic dean, as applicable, informs
34 the candidate of the decision, numerical vote, and all grounds for the decision before transmitting
35 the dossier to the next level.
- 36
- 37 e) All decisions or recommendations shall be reported promptly to the academic administrator of the
38 prior level, along with the reasons for any recommendations differing from the prior level's
39 recommendation.
- 40
- 41 f) All tenured faculty members of a candidate's local academic unit, members of the college
42 personnel committee, and members of the UBPT are permitted and expected to vote by a secret
43 ballot at a meeting in which the candidate's application is reviewed and discussed, exempting
44 those faculty who may be unable to participate due to approved leaves of absence. Under no

1 circumstances may a vote be cast through a proxy at any level in the retention, promotion or
2 tenure process. However, faculty in absentia may vote only if they use technology that permits
3 simultaneous participation in the review meeting and conveyance of their secret ballot at the time
4 of the vote. Moreover, faculty who vote in absentia are required to have reviewed a candidate's
5 materials before the academic unit's official vote. Only those faculty having a valid excuse as
6 defined in the unit guidelines may attend and vote using technology. Likewise, no faculty
7 member is permitted to add their vote or change their vote after the votes have been tallied.
8

- 9 g) The report on a recommendation shall fully discuss both strengths and weaknesses in the record
10 so as to provide an explanation for positive and negative votes. The number of faculty members
11 eligible to vote, the reason for any eligible faculty members not voting, the number of members in
12 attendance, and the actual votes must be reported. All faculty participating in the decision will
13 read the final report of the unit's recommendation and sign one of two forms. One form indicates
14 that the faculty member agrees that the report accurately describes the discussion of the unit. The
15 other form indicates that the report does not accurately describe the unit's discussion. The faculty
16 member's signature does not reflect their vote. Faculty who sign the form indicating inaccuracy
17 of the report must provide a signed statement, known as a signing statement, explaining why they
18 believe the report does not accurately describe the discussion. In the event a faculty member is
19 unwilling or unable to sign one of the two forms, the report will go forward with an explanation
20 from the person responsible for gathering the signatures.
21

22 **3.5.2.1 Signing Statement**

23
24 A faculty member who believes that an evaluation level report did not accurately reflect the discussion
25 during deliberation for promotion or tenure must prepare a signing statement. The signing statement
26 explains the individual's disagreement with the report's characterization of the meeting. It is restricted to
27 how the evaluating unit or committee report allegedly mischaracterized the discussion. The statement may
28 not present information or opinions about the candidate beyond those offered during the meeting. It need
29 not indicate the author's position on the candidacy.
30

31 Signing statements must be shared with both the candidate and all faculty members of the unit or
32 committee who were involved in the discussion at issue. Signing statements are due five business days
33 after the recommendation goes to the next level.
34

35 **3.5.2.2 Minority Report**

36
37 An allegation that an evaluating unit violated its guidelines, criteria, or processes, or those of the
38 university, takes the form of a minority report.
39

40 A minority report is restricted to how the evaluating unit or committee violated guidelines, process, or
41 criteria. It may not present information or opinion about the candidate beyond that offered during the
42 meeting.
43

1 Minority reports must be shared with both the candidate and all faculty members of the unit or committee.
2 The deadline for the minority report is five business days after the recommendation goes to the next level.
3 The evaluating unit or committee has five business days to respond to the minority report. These
4 documents must be added to the dossier for subsequent levels of review.
5

6 **3.5.3 Local Academic Unit**

7
8 The local academic unit is the unit that conducts the first level of review in the promotion and tenure
9 process. Some colleges are the local academic unit. In other colleges, the local academic unit might be a
10 school, a department, or a program. A college may have departments that do not function as local
11 academic units. For example, in the 2012-2013 academic year, the following colleges functioned as local
12 academic units: College of Communication, College of Law, School of Music, The Theatre School, and
13 The School of Continuing and Professional Studies.
14

15 **3.5.4 Local Academic Unit Is College**

16
17 When the local academic unit is the college, the two levels of review are the college and the university.
18 The college must follow uniform, written guidelines describing the evaluation process. Participation in
19 the tenure and promotion review process is limited to tenured faculty.
20

21 **3.5.4.1 Personnel Committee (optional)**

22
23 A local academic unit may choose to convene a personnel committee consisting of a subset of the tenured
24 faculty of the unit, excluding the dean. The committee must have at least three members. The personnel
25 committee, if one exists, evaluates the candidate, votes by secret ballot, and submits a signed report for
26 the dossier. The personnel committee vote cannot be used in lieu of any full tenured faculty vote.
27

28 **3.5.4.2 Tenured Faculty of the College**

29
30 The tenured faculty of the local academic unit evaluates the candidate, votes by secret ballot, and provides
31 a report for the dossier. This report may adapt or adopt a personnel committee's report, but it must reflect
32 the unit's discussion. Unit guidelines may limit the right to vote on a candidate to tenured faculty who
33 hold a higher rank than the candidate. Members of the unit's personnel committee vote in the evaluation
34 by the unit's tenured faculty.
35

36 **3.5.4.3 Dean**

37
38 The approved procedures of the local academic unit must stipulate whether the dean may attend the
39 meeting of the tenured faculty of the college in the two-level process. If the dean attends, they may
40 participate but not advocate or vote. The dean writes a separate report for the dossier expressing their
41 evaluation.
42
43
44

1 **3.5.4.4 Candidate Response to College Review**

2
3 After the dean provides the candidate with all reports from the college review, the candidate has the
4 option to write a response which will be placed in the dossier for review by the UBPT. The response, if
5 any, must be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs and the dean at least two business days prior to
6 the scheduled date of the candidate's hearing by the UBPT. The hearing must be scheduled to provide the
7 candidate with at least five business days to respond to the report. A response may address only the
8 candidate's issues or concerns with the college-level reports.

9
10 The next evaluation level is the university level.

11 **3.5.5 Local Academic Unit Is Not College**

12
13
14 If the local academic unit is not the college, it is typically a department, school, or program subordinate to
15 a college. The three levels of review are: local academic unit, college, and university. Each level of
16 review must follow uniform, written guidelines describing the evaluation process. If there is an
17 insufficient number of tenured faculty available in the local academic unit, the dean may appoint tenured
18 faculty from related academic units to the review process. Participation in the tenure and promotion
19 review process is limited to tenured faculty.

20 **3.5.5.1 Local Academic Unit Personnel Committee (Optional)**

21
22
23 A local academic unit may choose to convene a personnel committee consisting of a subset of the tenured
24 faculty of the unit. The committee must have at least three members. The local academic unit officer may
25 not be a member but may attend. The personnel committee, if one exists, evaluates the candidate, votes
26 by secret ballot, and submits a signed report for the dossier. The personnel committee vote cannot be used
27 in lieu of a vote by the unit's entire tenured faculty.

28 **3.5.5.2 Tenured Faculty of the Local Academic Unit**

29
30
31 The tenured faculty of the local academic unit evaluates the candidate, votes by secret ballot, and provides
32 a report for the dossier. This report may adapt or adopt a personnel committee's report but must reflect
33 the unit's discussion. Units may establish written procedures limiting the vote on a candidate to tenured
34 faculty who hold a higher rank than the candidate. Members of the unit's personnel committee vote as
35 part of the evaluation by the unit's tenured faculty. If the local academic unit has fewer than five eligible
36 tenured faculty members, the dean, after consultation with members of the unit, will appoint tenured
37 faculty of the appropriate rank to the evaluation committee from related academic units.

38 **3.5.5.3 Local Unit Academic Officer (Unit Chair or Director)**

39
40
41 The local unit academic officer may participate in the discussion by tenured faculty of the unit, but will
42 not vote on or advocate for or against the candidate's promotion or tenure. The unit academic officer will
43 write a separate report for the dossier expressing their evaluation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

3.5.5.4 Candidate Response to Local Academic Unit Review

After the local academic unit officer provides the candidate with all reports from the review, the candidate has the option to write a response which will be placed in the dossier for all subsequent levels of review. The response, if any, must be submitted to the dean and the local academic unit officer at least two business days prior to the scheduled date of the candidate's hearing by the college personnel committee. The hearing must be scheduled to provide the candidate with at least five business days to respond to the report. A response may address only the candidate's issues or concerns with the local academic unit's reports.

3.5.5.5 College-Level Personnel Committee

In colleges with a college-level personnel committee, this committee conducts a separate evaluation of the candidate, votes by secret ballot, and writes a report for the dossier. The college personnel committee is a subset of the tenured faculty from the college with broad representation from different units within the college. The minimum number of members on any college personnel committee is five. Only tenure-line faculty may vote in membership elections for those committees that are elected. The college-level committee must have representation from tenured faculty at the rank of full professor. Members of the college personnel committee who voted at the local academic unit may not vote at the college level. If so specified in the college's guidelines, the dean may participate in the meeting of the college personnel committee, but may not vote or advocate for or against a candidate. The report of the college personnel committee is provided to the dean of the college. There is no college-wide tenured faculty vote.

3.5.5.6 Dean

The dean provides a separate evaluation of the candidate for the dossier.

3.5.5.7 Candidate Response to College Review

After the dean provides the candidate with all reports from the review, the candidate has the option to write a response which will be placed in the dossier for the UBPT. The response, if any, must be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs and the dean at least two business days prior to the scheduled date of the candidate's hearing by the UBPT. The hearing must be scheduled to provide the candidate at least five business days to respond to the report. A response may address only the candidate's issues or concerns with the college's reports.

The next evaluation level is the university review.

1 **3.5.6 University Review**

3 **3.5.6.1 University Board on Promotion and Tenure**

5 The University Board on Promotion and Tenure (UBPT) evaluates the candidate, votes by secret ballot on
6 tenure, promotion, or both and provides a written report summarizing the basis of its recommendation,
7 including the vote count. In evaluating the candidate, the UBPT takes the following steps:

- 9 a) Reviews the full dossier.
- 11 b) Conducts a hearing, with five of the seven appointed faculty members constituting a quorum. The
12 provost is expected to be present when a candidate is being reviewed. In exceptional
13 circumstances, a designee may attend in the provost's absence. The candidate, the local academic
14 unit officer (when applicable), and the college dean are expected to appear before the UBPT.
- 16 c) Conducts a substantive review applying current university-wide standards and criteria for tenure
17 and promotion.
- 19 d) Examines the application of lower-level guidelines to the candidate.
- 21 e) Prepares its recommendation, which it shares with the candidate and the provost.

23 **3.5.6.2 Candidate Response to UBPT**

25 The candidate has the option to write a response to the UBPT evaluation which will be added to the file
26 and sent to the provost for the provost's consideration. A response must focus only on issues or concerns
27 the candidate may have with the UBPT report. The deadline for this response appears in the calendar.

29 **3.5.6.3 Provost Decision**

31 The provost makes the final decision on tenure or promotion. Only in rare instances and for compelling
32 reasons will the provost overturn a promotion or tenure recommendation made by the UBPT.

34 If the provost's decision differs from the UBPT recommendation, the provost must prepare a written
35 explanation of the decision and provide it to the UBPT, the candidate, the dean, and the local unit
36 academic officer (if different from the dean).

38 **3.5.7 Detailed Procedures**

40 **3.5.7.1 Committees**

42 The following rules apply to the various committees conducting reviews for tenure and promotion.

1 Only tenured faculty may sit on any committee evaluating a faculty member for tenure or promotion at
 2 any level of evaluation; only tenure-line faculty may vote in membership elections for those committees
 3 that are elected.

4
 5 Except where otherwise provided in this chapter, a local academic unit or college may adopt written
 6 standards for its evaluative committees that address tenure and promotion. The standards may address,
 7 among other topics:

- 8 • Committee membership
- 9 • Criteria for chairing the committee
- 10 • Rank and status of faculty who may elect members of the committee
- 11 • Rank of members who may vote on promotion to full professor
- 12 • Term length for committee membership
- 13 • Process for election of the committee chair

14 **3.5.7.2 Local Academic Unit (Not College) Personnel Committees**

15
 16 Members must be tenured and at least associate rank. The committee must have at least three members.
 17 The tenure-line faculty of the local academic unit elect the personnel committee, and the personnel
 18 committee elects its chairperson. The local academic unit academic officer may not be a member of this
 19 committee. The officer may participate in committee meetings but shall not advocate for or against the
 20 candidate or vote.
 21

22 **3.5.7.3 Tenured Faculty of the Local Academic Unit**

23
 24 All and only tenured faculty of at least associate rank are expected to participate in votes for tenure and
 25 promotion at the local academic unit level. For promotion to full professor, the local academic unit may
 26 limit votes to full professors. If the local academic unit has fewer than five eligible tenured faculty
 27 members, the dean, after consultation with members of the unit, will appoint tenured faculty of the
 28 appropriate rank to the evaluation committee from related academic units.
 29

30
 31 The tenured faculty of the local academic unit elect a chair to conduct these promotion and tenure
 32 meetings and to organize the reports. The chairperson may not be the local academic unit academic
 33 officer. If the local academic unit is not the college, the local academic unit officer may participate at
 34 promotion and tenure meetings but shall not vote or advocate for or against the candidate. If the local
 35 academic unit is the college, college procedures should stipulate whether the dean may attend the meeting
 36 of the tenured faculty. If the dean attends, they may participate but not advocate or vote for or against the
 37 candidate.
 38

39 **3.5.7.4 College Personnel Committees**

40
 41 Only tenured faculty may serve on a college personnel committee. College guidelines may limit the
 42 membership to full professors. College guidelines should also address how to convene an adequate
 43 number of full professors for deciding promotion to full professor. The minimum number of members on
 44 any college personnel committee is five. Terms are three years and are staggered. The committee

1 members elect a chairperson for a one-year term. The chairperson conducts meetings of the committee
 2 and organizes the committee's reports. The dean shall not be the chairperson of the committee. The dean
 3 may participate in college personnel committee meetings but shall not vote or advocate for or against a
 4 candidate.

6 **3.5.7.5 University Board on Promotion and Tenure**

8 The UBPT members must be tenured full professors. Associate deans, deans, and local academic unit
 9 officers (e.g., department chairs) are ineligible to serve. The seven members of the UBPT serve as
 10 representatives of disciplines across the university, not as representatives of their colleges. Members are
 11 selected by open nominations and self-nominations across colleges, reviewed by Faculty Council
 12 Committee on Committees, and interviewed and elected by Faculty Council. Terms are for three years
 13 and are staggered. The UBPT members elect a chairperson annually. The provost or their designee is
 14 expected to be present at all UBPT meetings where candidates are reviewed; the provost (or their
 15 designee) shall not vote or advocate for or against any candidate.

17 The UBPT has two additional responsibilities. First, it reviews changes to evaluation guidelines, criteria
 18 and procedures developed by local academic units, departments, schools, and colleges for clarity and
 19 consonance with university-wide criteria. Second, at the conclusion of each year's proceedings, the UBPT
 20 shares any recommendations it may have with the provost regarding the board's future functioning.

22 The provost and the chair of the UBPT refer any policy matter raised by UBPT members to the Faculty
 23 Council; the provost also makes available to the full faculty an annual statistical summary of the
 24 university's final tenure and promotion decisions.

26 **3.6 Materials**

28 **3.6.1 Dossier**

30 **3.6.1.1 Items Supplied By Candidate**

32 A candidate for promotion and/or tenure supplies the following materials:

- 34 • Complete professional curriculum vitae, paginated with the candidate's name on each page
- 35 • A statement of up to 3,000 words in which the candidate emphasizes those achievements or
 36 qualifications to which evaluators should particularly attend
- 37 • Evidence of collaborative work, if applicable
- 38 • Evidence of teaching effectiveness beyond course evaluations and peer reviews, including, at a
 39 minimum, selected syllabi, course assignments, and exams
- 40 • Evidence of service, including, at a minimum, description of individual contributions and
 41 supporting documentation such as letters from committee chairs
- 42 • Other evidence the candidate may wish to submit, e.g., awards and special recognitions
- 43 • A single copy of articles, papers, published manuscripts, video and audio recordings, and other
 44 examples of scholarship and creative activities

3.6.1.2 Items Supplied By Academic Unit and College

The local academic unit and college committee add the following materials to the dossier:

- Local academic unit and college guidelines
- The written recommendation(s) from the reviews conducted at each level, including signature forms
- Signing statements and minority reports, if any
- Candidate responses, if any
- Data obtained by the college through the student input instrument
- Documentation that substantiates according to the local academic unit guidelines, and with sufficient detail, the faculty member's contributions to any collaborative work submitted in the Dossier.
- For tenure, an evaluation of the candidate's scholarship, research, and/or other creative activities by at least two external experts
- For promotion to full professor, an evaluation of the candidate's scholarship, research, and/or other creative activities by a minimum of three external experts
- For tenure and promotion to associate professor, all teaching evaluations by students for all courses. For promotion to full professor, all teaching evaluations by students while in current rank and in the year of application to associate professor.
- Any internal peer reviews of teaching conducted specifically for purposes of promotion and tenure

Review is limited to these items, unless the local academic unit approves any additions to the dossier. Unsolicited material will not be added to the dossier.

3.6.1.3 Additions to the Dossier

Because of the length of the review process, it is possible that a candidate's record may change significantly or that other information pertinent to a case may come to light during the course of the review.

After the initial submission of the dossier to the local academic unit, the candidate may request the addition of new information to the dossier at any level of the review process prior to the final vote by the UBPT. The request for additions to the dossier must be made to the local unit academic officer and must include supporting documentation to verify the accuracy of the new information. The local academic unit officer must rule on the request within five business days of receiving it.

The local unit academic officer will determine whether the new information should be added to the dossier based on one or more of the following criteria:

- The new information constitutes an update to the status of scholarly or creative work already mentioned in the dossier.

- 1 • The new information constitutes a significant development, such as the announcement of a major
2 award or recognition, related to the candidate's work already reported in the dossier.
- 3 • The new information is not related to work previously reported in the dossier but, in the judgment
4 of the local unit academic officer, may have significant impact on the outcome of the case.
5

6 The local academic unit officer of the originating unit must formally transmit all new material approved
7 for addition to the dossier directly to the level at which the case is currently under review and include
8 with the new material an explanation of the reasons for the addition and at what level of review the new
9 information became available. The entity currently reviewing the case should add these new items to the
10 candidate's dossier, evaluate them along with the rest of the dossier, and provide them to subsequent
11 levels of review.
12

13 The local academic unit officer shall also supply copies of the explanatory memorandum to the candidate
14 and to the individual in charge of each level already completed at the time the material is added.
15

16 **3.6.2 External Letters**

17

18 By June 1, candidates must submit to the local academic unit officers their CV and selected
19 publications/documentation of creative activities for transmittal to external reviewers. Local academic
20 units should identify an initial list of potential external reviewers by June 15. Local academic units will
21 ask external reviewers to prepare letters over the summer for receipt prior to candidate review in the fall.
22

23 **3.6.2.1 Authors of External Letters**

24

25 Local academic units should obtain letters from persons whose judgment is respected in the candidate's
26 field of expertise and who can provide an impartial assessment of the candidate's scholarship or creative
27 activities. The candidate may nominate external reviewers and must disclose and contextualize any
28 current or prior relationship with the potential reviewers on their list.. The local academic unit may select
29 from the candidate's nominations or from other sources. When identifying external reviewers, candidates
30 and committees should take into account both the objectivity of the reviewer and the reviewer's rank,
31 reputation, and stature. The local academic unit has full discretion in selecting external reviewers.
32 However, while exercising its full discretion in selecting external reviewers, the unit should explain the
33 process for doing so as specified in their guidelines. In this report, the unit must also explain the rationale
34 for its choice of reviewers, especially when the reviewers are at an academic rank equal to or lower than
35 that of the candidate. Moreover, when the reviewer is not a tenured faculty member within the
36 academy, a justification must be provided for their selection.
37

38 If a candidate has done collaborative work, a separate set of letters can be solicited and submitted from
39 collaborators in addition to, but not as a substitute for, the external review letters. The university's letters
40 to collaborators should request that they describe the division of labor and nature of the collaborative
41 effort.
42
43
44

3.6.2.2 External Letter Contents

The solicitation letter to a potential reviewer should be neutral, asking only for an objective assessment of the candidate's research or creative activities and requesting that the reviewer eschew advocacy for or against tenure and promotion. The solicitation letter should also ask the reviewer to explain the nature of the reviewer's relationship to the candidate. The letter should ask the evaluator to cover the following general ground:

- the nature of the evaluator's professional interactions with the candidate
- the quality of the candidate's work
- the impact of the candidate's work

Readers will disregard any portions of an external letter advocating for or against tenure and promotion.

3.6.2.3 Confidentiality of External Letters

Under Illinois state law, a candidate may see the contents of their personnel file, with an exception applicable to external review letters. To ensure that reviewers provide fully candid assessments, the university protects the identity of the external reviewers. Therefore, any citations of the external review letters in department or chair reports and the reports of subsequent reviewing levels must be redacted, eliminating any and all information that would identify the reviewer to the candidate. Local academic units must also ensure that external review letters given to the candidates are redacted to protect the authors' identities.

3.6.2.4 Suggested Sample Letter

Dear Dr. AA:

As you are a recognized authority in your field, I am writing to request your assistance. Dr. BB is due to be reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor in academic year YYYY-YYYY. I solicit your evaluation of the research [creative activities] of Dr. BB. Please only evaluate the candidate's research or creative activities and refrain from rendering a judgment on whether the candidate should be promoted or tenured. Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent legally practicable.

In particular, please address the following:

- the quality of the publications or creative activities of the candidate
- the impact of the candidate's work
- the quality of the journals in which the candidate has published
- the nature of your professional interaction with the candidate, if applicable, and
- comments, should you have any, of the candidate's collaboration with other scholars in the field.

1 To assist in your evaluation, I am enclosing the following information: Dr. BB's latest curriculum vitae;
2 the three papers or book manuscript listed below, selected by Dr. BB; and a brief summary of the
3 department's [local academic unit's] promotion criteria.
4

5 Although Illinois state law allows employees to view their personnel files, there is an exception for
6 external review letters. Any information that would identify you will be redacted from all documents
7 seen by the candidate.
8

9 I realize that this information is rather extensive and will require considerable effort on your part to
10 review. Your assistance in helping us evaluate Dr. BB's credentials will be greatly appreciated and will
11 constitute an important element in the overall evaluation. I would be very grateful if you could respond to
12 us in writing no later than [DATE]. If possible, kindly send your reply, along with a copy of your most
13 recent CV, electronically to@depaul.edu as an attachment.
14

15 Sincerely,

16 DD

17 Chair

18 Personnel Committee

19 [Name of Dept. and Unit]

20 Enclosures: [List the selected works]
21

22 **3.6.3 Student Input**

23

24 Student input must be part of a candidate's dossier. Committees will acquire student input from course
25 evaluations and information collected through an instrument such as a survey. The college will design the
26 instrument with student input. The instrument will generally solicit opinions from one or more of the
27 following groups: alumni, past students who have taken a class from the candidate, student advisees, or
28 students who have been supervised by the candidate in research projects or independent study.
29

30 **3.6.3.1 Student Input Instrument**

31

32 Each college personnel committee, or in the absence of a college-level committee, the local unit personnel
33 committee, shall have an instrument for collecting data from students, a process of gathering data, and a
34 template for reporting the results. These elements must be created by a committee of at least two students
35 (preferably including both graduate and undergraduate) and at least two tenured faculty members.
36

37 The instrument will be used to gather additional data from students beyond the standard course
38 evaluations. The report should clearly specify:
39

- 40 • the type of methodology used for data collection and analysis
- 41 • the targeted groups surveyed, and
- 42 • the questions asked of survey participants.
43

1 The college personnel committee must approve the instrument, process, report template and any
2 subsequent modifications. Before approval, the college personnel committee should solicit and consider
3 input from the college's local academic units.

4 5 **3.6.3.2 Evaluation and Submission of Student Input Data**

6
7 The college bears responsibility for data collection. A student review committee then analyzes data
8 collected via this process for each promotion and tenure candidate, as well as aggregate information on
9 course evaluations provided by the unit. The student review committee consists of up to three students,
10 none of whom is currently enrolled in a class with the candidate under review. After analyzing the
11 collected data, the review committee provides a written report, along with all the raw data, to the
12 personnel committee of the local academic unit and to the candidate. The student input data becomes part
13 of the candidate's dossier. The personnel committee may request a meeting with a representative from the
14 student review committee, if the committee deems it necessary.

15
16 Once student representatives furnish their report to the local academic unit, they do not appear before
17 subsequent evaluative bodies. The student report will be forwarded with other promotion and tenure
18 materials to each review level.

19 20 **3.7 Appeal**

21
22 *Appeal procedures for a tenure-line faculty member who has been reviewed for tenure, promotion, or*
23 *promotion and tenure by the University Board on Promotion and Tenure are found in Chapter 5 Section*
24 *5.1.2.3.*

25

1 **3.8 Schedule for Informal and Formal Reviews**
 2
 3

PROBATIONARY REVIEWS FOR TENURE-LINE FACULTY WITH SIX-YEAR PROBATIONARY PERIOD*			
Year at DePaul	Timing and Contract Year	Type of Review	Notice to Faculty Member of Renewal- or Nonrenewal
1st	Winter quarter of first year at DePaul, for Year 2 contract renewal	May be informal or formal	March 1
2nd	Fall quarter of second year at DePaul, for Year 3 contract renewal	One of these 2 reviews must be formal; the other may be informal or formal.	December 15
	Spring quarter of second year at DePaul, for Year 4 contract renewal		June 30
3rd	During third year at DePaul, with timing per college's schedule, for Year 5 contract renewal	May be informal or formal	June 30
4th	During fourth year at DePaul, with timing per college's schedule, for Year 6 contract renewal	Formal	June 30
5th	During fifth year at DePaul, with timing per college's schedule, for year 7 contract renewal	May be informal or formal. Must be formal if non-reappointment is realistic possibility.	June 30
6th	Sixth Year at DePaul, with timing per Faculty Handbook calendar	Promotion and Tenure Review	June 30

4 *The contract renewal schedule for tenure-line faculty who come in with years of credit towards tenure is
 5 the same as for other tenure-line faculty, but the year of the promotion and tenure review varies. The
 6 initial faculty contract stipulates the year of the promotion and tenure review.
 7

1 **3.9 Schedule for Promotion and Tenure**

2
3 **3.9.1 *University Promotion and Tenure Schedule***

4
5 The following is the suggested schedule for the university promotion and tenure process. Whenever
6 possible, the university will abide by the proposed timetable. Any changes to this calendar must provide
7 at least the allotted time period for candidate responses, minority reports, and signing statements.
8

9 **April 1**

10 Letter of notification as to the eligibility to apply for promotion and tenure sent to the faculty member
11 from the provost
12

13 **May 1**

14 Letter requesting consideration for promotion and/or tenure submitted by the faculty member to the
15 provost, the academic dean, and the head of the academic unit
16

17 **May 15**

18 Provost acknowledges receipt of applications for promotion, for tenure, or for promotion and tenure.
19

20 **June 1**

21 Candidate provides CV and selected publications/documentation of creative activities to local academic
22 unit officers for submission to external reviewers
23

24 **June 15**

25 Local academic unit identifies an initial list of potential external reviewers
26

27 **First day of fall quarter**

28 Candidate's complete materials due to the local academic unit
29

30 **January 15**

31 Report from the academic unit submitted to the academic dean and to the candidate.
32

33 **January 31**

34 Report from the academic dean and the academic unit of the following colleges and schools submitted to
35 the Office of Academic Affairs and to the candidate
36

- 37 • College of Communication
 - 38 • College of Computing and Digital Media
 - 39 • College of Law
 - 40 • School of Music
 - 41 • School of Continuing and Professional Studies
 - 42 • The Theatre School
- 43
44

1 **March 1**

2 Reports from the academic deans of the Driehaus College of Business and the College of Education and
3 all relevant materials submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs and to the candidate

4
5 **March 15**

6 Reports from the academic deans of the College of Liberal Arts & Social Sciences and the College of
7 Science and Health and all relevant materials submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs and to the
8 candidate.

9
10 **Winter/Spring Quarter**

11 University Board on Faculty Promotion and Tenure meets with faculty candidates

12
13 **Five business days from the last UBPT meeting but no later than May 15**

14 UBPT reports due to candidates

15
16 **Two weeks from the date UBPT reports are sent to candidates**

17 Optional candidate response due to UBPT

18 UBPT report and all relevant materials for all candidates submitted to provost

19
20 **June 15**

21 Decision of the university provost

22 Notification to candidate of the provost's decision follows in a timely fashion