The Bylaws are implemented in some instances in supplementary policy documents adopted by the Faculty. Other major College policies are also embodied in actions taken by the Faculty. These documents are included in this packet. The list below is suggestive and will be supplemented as additional Faculty action occurs.

1. Procedures for Executive Committee Action on Courses and Curricula Proposals
2. Guidelines for Limiting the Number of Executive Officers on Executive Committee
3. Evaluation of Administrators
4. LAS Faculty Appeals Procedural Guidelines
5. Procedures for Action on a Unit’s Request to Affiliate/Withdraw From a School
6. Procedures for Review of Possible Unit Termination
7. Periodic Review of Associate Professors

Please refer to the LAS and Provost Office websites for the most current version of College and Campus policies.
BYLAWS

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Adopted by the Faculty May 2, 1991
Revised April 24, 2013
I. NAME

The name of this assembly shall be the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

II. POWERS AND DUTIES

The Faculty shall have such powers and duties as may be lawfully delegated to it and those which the Faculty has been accustomed to exercise. Among the powers and duties of the Faculty are the following:

1. To establish rules for the conduct of its business.
2. To establish policies for the governance of the College in its internal administration.
3. To elect the Secretary of the Faculty.
4. To determine the composition of committees except as hereinafter specified for the conduct of Faculty business and to assign functions and responsibilities to them.
5. To assign functions and responsibilities to the Executive Committee of the College.
6. To recommend creation within the College of subordinate units such as Schools whose faculty shall have the fullest measure of autonomy consistent with the maintenance of general College policy and correct academic and administrative relations with other units within the University.
7. To establish the academic policy of the College,
   a. exercising jurisdiction in all educational matters falling within the scope of its programs, including the determination of its curricula, and
   b. making recommendations on matters of educational policy relevant to the College but which fall under the jurisdiction of other bodies.

These Bylaws are intended to supplement the University Statutes. Where it appears there may be conflicts, the Statutes as interpreted by the Chancellor on advice of the Campus Legal Counsel must prevail.

III. MEMBERSHIP AND VOTING RIGHTS

A. The Faculty consists of those members of the academic staff who are tenured or receiving probationary credit toward tenure, with the rank or title in the College of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, the Dean, the President, the Chancellor, the Provost, Directors of Schools within the College, and such other members of the University Faculty as the Chancellor may assign thereto. Administrative staff are members of the Faculty only if they also hold such faculty appointments. The Dean of the College, on the advice of the College Executive Committee, may add to the Faculty a representative of any other department or group as may be entitled to representation by virtue of participation in the program of instruction in the College. In making this appointment, the Dean will consult with the executive officer of the department or group thus entitled to representation. The Executive Committee of the College, in consultation with the Dean and in accordance with University Statutes shall determine the Faculty membership and voting rights of those with academic rank or title in the College who are not tenured or receiving probationary credit toward tenure.

B. All members of the Faculty as defined in paragraph A shall be entitled to participate in meetings of the Faculty by voice and by vote.
C. Administrative staff bearing the title of Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, and Associate Director or Assistant Director of a School within the College and who are not included within the definition of members of the faculty in paragraph A, together with Emeritus Faculty, Visiting Faculty, and student representatives on standing committees, shall be accorded voice but not vote at Faculty meetings.

IV. OFFICERS

A. The Dean

1. As chief executive officer of the College, responsible for its administration, the Dean is the agent of the Faculty for the execution of College educational policy.

2. The Dean shall perform the functions required by Article III Section 3.d. of the Statutes. In particular the Dean shall:

   a. Formulate and present policies to the Faculty for its consideration, but this shall not be interpreted to abridge the right of any member of the Faculty to present any matter to the Faculty.

   b. Report to the Faculty on the work of the College.

   c. Serve as the medium of communication for all official business of the College with other campus authorities, the students, and the public.

   d. Represent the College in conferences or designate representatives for specific conferences.

   e. Prepare the budget of the College and provide annual update to the Executive Committee and faculty.

   f. Recommend the appointment, reappointment, nonreappointment, or promotion of officers and members of the teaching staff. In these matters the Dean shall review recommendations received from appropriate governance bodies within all schools, departments, or other units involved.

   g. Make recommendations to the Provost regarding the appointment of Associate and Assistant Deans and Directors of Schools and unit executive officers.

   h. In the case of administrative officers within the College who are required to be reappointed annually, obtain the advice of the appropriate governance body of the unit concerned regarding such reappointment and transmit this advice to the Provost.

   i. Initiate review of the performance of administrative officers within the College at such times as are mandated by the Statutes.

3. The performance of the Dean shall be evaluated at the least every five years in a manner determined by the College Faculty and in accordance with the statutes and guidelines adopted by the Urbana-Champaign Senate.
B. Secretary

1. The Secretary of the Faculty shall be nominated annually by the Executive Committee from among the Faculty and the Associate Deans of the College and may serve successive terms. In the call for the first regular meeting in each academic year the name of the candidate shall be announced. Additional nominations may be received from the floor. The Secretary shall serve until a successor is elected and qualified.

2. Duties of the Secretary shall be to:
   a. Distribute to members of the Faculty, and such other persons as the Dean or Executive Committee may direct, all notices, calls, agenda, and minutes of all Faculty meetings.
   b. Record and preserve minutes of all meetings of the Faculty, the votes taken therein, special reports, and all other official actions.
   c. Preserve on file all documents which are made part of the proceedings of Faculty meetings.
   d. Notify committees of all business referred to them by action of the Faculty, furnish them documents and papers laid before the Faculty relating to such business, and preserve all reports of committees to the Faculty.
   e. Conduct the balloting and report the results to the Faculty for all elections.

C. Parliamentarian

1. The Dean shall appoint annually the Parliamentarian for the Faculty.

2. The Parliamentarian shall advise the Dean and the Faculty on questions of parliamentary procedure.

D. Officers of the College

For the purposes of these Bylaws, the term "Officers of the College" shall include any members of the College administrative staff so designated by the Dean.
V. MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY

A. Regular Meetings

1. Presiding Officer

   The Dean shall be the presiding officer. In the Dean’s absence, the designee of the Dean, normally the Vice-Chair of the Executive Committee, shall preside.

2. Frequency

   There shall be at least one regular meeting each semester, with the dates to be fixed by the Dean and announced at the beginning of each semester.

3. Call and Notice

   a. Regular meetings shall be called by the Dean.

   b. The Secretary shall furnish members entitled to vote in meetings the agenda of each meeting at least five calendar days prior to the meeting.

4. Agenda and Order of Business

   a. Agenda. Items may be placed on the agenda in any of the following ways:

      i. By the Dean

      ii. By the Executive Committee

      iii. By any member of the Faculty who wishes to petition that an item be included on the agenda of a regular meeting provided that such item shall be submitted to the Dean at least ten calendar days before the scheduled date of the meeting, and that the Dean, in consultation with the Executive Committee, shall consider and may schedule inclusion of such item on the agenda or may refer such item to an appropriate committee. This provision shall not abridge the right of any member of the Faculty to present any matter at any regular meeting under the appropriate heading of “old” or “new” business (see section 6 below).

   b. The order of business for a regular meeting shall be determined by the Dean in consultation with the Executive Committee.

5. Quorum

   At regular meetings the quorum shall consist of those members present and entitled to vote.
6. New Business

a. Items introduced as new business at any regular meeting shall be introduced in the form of a resolution. No such resolution shall be debated or adopted at the regular meeting at which it is introduced, but shall be referred by the Dean to the appropriate committee or shall be scheduled for consideration at the next regular meeting of the Faculty. The sponsor in introducing the proposal may speak for not more than ten minutes in explanation of the purpose of the resolution.

b. Items submitted to committees by individuals, departments, or other academic units may be reported out at the discretion of the committee, except that any member may introduce a motion under the heading of new business to compel a report on a given matter at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

7. Voting at Regular Meetings

a. The right to vote shall be limited to those present and entitled to vote as defined by Article III.

b. Resolutions shall be passed and uncontested elections determined by vote of those present and voting, except as may be hereinafter provided.

c. Voting shall be by voice vote of Yeas and Nays, but a division may be ordered by the presiding officer or when requested by a member present and entitled to vote.

d. Elections in which a contest exists shall be voted by paper ballot.

e. A motion to employ a paper ballot in voting on a resolution is non-debatable and shall require a majority vote.

8. Observers

a. Except as limited below, persons not entitled to vote may attend meetings as observers to the extent that space permits.

b. If the Dean judges separate seating to be necessary, persons attending a meeting as observers will be seated in a designated area separate from the voting members.

c. Observers may, with the consent of a majority vote of members of the assembly in attendance, be given the right to speak for no more than five minutes on any matter before the body.

d. The Faculty, by a majority vote of those present at any meeting, may determine that any item on the agenda shall be considered in executive session. Only voting members and Officers of the College shall be present in executive session.
B. Special Meetings

1. Call

   a. Special meetings may be called by the Dean, by the Executive Committee, or by
      resolution made and approved in a regular meeting.

   b. Upon receipt of a written petition of 50 or more members entitled to vote, the
      Dean shall call a special meeting within ten working days.

   c. A petition for a special meeting shall include the proposed agenda and/or
      resolution(s) to be proposed, with any supporting documentation. One person
      among the signatories thereto shall be designated as responsible for such
      consultations concerning scheduling and arrangements as may be required.

2. Notice

   The notice provisions for a special meeting shall be the same as for a regular meeting,
   including the provisions for distribution of the agenda, with the following exceptions:

   a. All notices of special meetings shall be plainly marked "Special Meeting".

   b. Should a situation require immediate action, the Dean, with the consent of a
      majority of the Executive Committee, may designate a special meeting as an
      emergency meeting; notices of an emergency meeting must be sent to members
      entitled to vote not less than 24 hours before the hour set for such meeting and
      must be plainly marked "Emergency Meeting".

3. Agenda

   The agenda items for special meetings shall be confined to the items listed on the call
   for the meeting, and the discussions and actions at such a meeting shall be limited
   thereto.

4. Quorum

   At special Faculty meetings at least 100 members entitled to vote must be present for
   final action to be taken on a main motion.

5. Other Procedural Matters

   Other provisions for voting, balloting and observers shall be the same for special
   meetings as for regular meetings.
VI. COMMITTEES

A. Electoral Groups.

1. For purposes of nomination and election to committees, the Faculty of the College is divided into eight electoral groups as follows:

   Group I: Classics, History, Philosophy, and Religion

   Group II: English, African American Studies, American Indian Studies, Asian American Studies, Gender and Women’s Studies, and Latina/Latino Studies

   Group III: Comparative and World Literature; East Asian Languages and Cultures; French; Germanic Languages and Literatures; Linguistics; Slavic Languages and Literatures; and Spanish, Italian and Portuguese

   Group IV: Anthropology, Communication, Political Science and Sociology*

   Group V: Economics, and Psychology

   Group VI: School of Integrative Biology; School of Molecular and Cellular Biology

   Group VII: School of Earth, Society and the Environment, and the School of Chemical Sciences

   Group VIII: Astronomy, Mathematics and Statistics

*NOTE: as approved by the faculty at the April 24, 2013 meeting, the Department of Sociology will remain in Group V until the 2015 elections for the LAS Executive Committee effective for Fall 2015.

2. For purposes of nomination and election to committees, members of the faculty appointed by the Dean under Article III, Section A, to represent college-approved programs of instruction from outside the college shall be considered to belong to the electoral groups as follows:

   Group I: Art History

   Group VII: Physics

   Group VIII: Computer Science

B. Voting Procedures.

All elections to College Committees shall be carried out under the direction of the Secretary of the Faculty. Ballots shall be distributed, returned, and counted by procedures designed to assure a secret vote. The Secretary will announce the results of the elections for the Executive Committee and Faculty Appeals Committee electronically.

C. Restriction of Eligibility.

Only Faculty with at least a half-time appointment in the College shall be eligible for election to the Executive Committee, the Faculty Appeals Committee, and the Nominations Committee. No individual shall be eligible for election to two consecutive full terms on any one of these three committees, but no such restriction shall apply to service on standing
committees. Faculty with joint appointments shall be eligible for election in the Group in which they hold their primary appointment.

D. Executive Committee

1. Membership

   a. The Executive Committee shall consist of eight members elected for two-year staggered terms by and from the Faculty.

   b. Only tenured members of the faculty holding the rank of Professor shall be eligible for election to the Executive Committee.

   c. The Dean is a member *ex-officio* and chairs the Executive Committee. A Vice-Chair, to preside in the Dean’s absence, shall be elected by the Executive Committee from among its members. When the Executive Committee meets to prepare or give advice to the Chancellor and President on the appointment or reappointment of the Dean or to review the Dean’s performance, the Dean shall not be present and the Committee shall be chaired by the Vice-Chair.

   d. The Executive Committee may appoint a secretary from outside its membership to keep a record of its proceedings. Such an individual shall not have a vote.

2. Duties

   The duties of the Executive Committee shall include those prescribed by the *University Statutes* and these *Bylaws*. Principally, these obligations include the following:

   a. Assist and advise the Dean in the conduct of College business, including the preparation of agenda for meetings of the Faculty, the calling of special meetings, and the determination of the status of an appointee where doubt exists as to eligibility for voting membership in the Faculty.

   b. Advise the Dean on appointments of tenured faculty, and promotions of the Faculty upon receipt of recommendations from all schools, departments, or other units involved.

   c. Advise upon proposals pertaining to programs, departments, or other academic units.

   d. Advise Provost, the Chancellor, and the President on each recommendation of appointment or reappointment of the Dean of the College.

   e. Consult annually with the Dean on the budget of the College.

   f. Act *ad interim* in the name of the Faculty in an emergency situation; each such action shall be reported to the Faculty at its next regular meeting.

   g. Act for the Faculty on recommendations from the Courses and Curricula Committee concerning program proposals and academic policy following procedures approved by the Faculty.

3. Nominations

   a. Members will serve two-year staggered terms beginning August 16 of the year they are elected. Nominations and elections shall be conducted in the spring semester.
Members representing even-numbered electoral groups will be elected in even-numbered years and those from odd-numbered groups will be elected in odd-numbered years.

b. No more than two members of the Executive Committee shall be executive officers of schools, departments, or other units of instruction.

c. There shall be one member from each of the eight electoral groups. In any one year, nominees must belong to those electoral groups represented by members whose terms will expire that year.

d. Persons elected to the Executive Committee shall be nominated by and from the Faculty of the College. Each nomination shall be made by a petition signed by eight members of the Faculty and addressed to the Secretary of the Faculty.

e. Additional nominations as are deemed necessary to provide a representative slate of at least two candidates for each vacancy will be solicited from units until the ballot is complete.

f. No nomination will be presented to the electorate without written consent of the nominee.

g. Variations may be approved by the current Executive Committee under the guidance of the Vice Chair.

4. Elections

a. The ballot shall carry the names of the nominees and their departmental affiliations. Each member of the Faculty shall be entitled to vote for a candidate from each electoral group.

b. The candidate in each electoral group receiving the largest number of votes shall be declared elected. In the event of a tie, the members of the Executive Committee in office at the time of the election shall break the tie by secret ballot; if the committee vote results in a tie, the tie shall be broken by the Dean.

c. If needed, newly elected members may fill vacancies which occur during the summer months prior to the beginning of their term of office.

5. Vacancies

a. In the event of a vacancy that will extend no longer than one semester, the Executive Committee will elect a faculty member from the electoral group in which the vacancy occurred.

b. In the event of a vacancy that will extend longer than one semester, a special election to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the term will be conducted according to the regular nomination and election procedures specified above (Article VI. Secs. D.3 and D.4).

6. Attendance at Meetings

The Executive Committee may authorize attendance at its closed meetings by persons whom it designates or invites.

E. Faculty Appeals Committee
1. Membership
   a. The Faculty Appeals Committee shall consist of eight members elected for two-year staggered terms by and from the Faculty.
   b. Only tenured members of the faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor and above shall be eligible for election to the Faculty Appeals Committee.
   c. No executive officer of any unit may serve on the Committee.
   d. Each spring semester the Committee will elect a chair from among its continuing members. The Officer of the College who serves as liaison to the Committee will convene the initial meeting for the purpose of electing a chair.

2. Duties.
   a. The Faculty Appeals Committee will consider appeals of personnel decisions, especially in the following areas: rollbacks, promotion and/or tenure, sabbatical leaves, leaves of absence without pay, and terminations.
   b. The Committee will be governed in its operation by the procedural guidelines established by the Faculty.

3. Nomination and Election
   Members representing even-numbered electoral groups will be elected in odd-numbered years and those from odd-numbered groups will be elected in even-numbered years, members to serve two-year terms beginning January 6 of the year following their election. In case of a vacancy, the candidate from that electoral group with the next highest vote total shall serve for the remainder of the term. In the fall semester the Secretary of the Faculty will conduct elections for positions that will become vacant in January. The Secretary will call for nominations by petitions signed by at least eight members of the Faculty. If at least two candidates from each group are not thereby produced, the Faculty members of the Nominations Committee will fill out the slates. If after due diligence, the Nominations Committee cannot identify a suitable candidate or candidates from an electoral group, a substitute who is not a member of that group but is qualified to represent that group may be selected. Each member of the Faculty shall be entitled to vote for a candidate from each electoral group.

F. Nominations Committees

1. Membership
   The Nominations Committee shall consist of ten members: eight faculty members elected by the Faculty from the electoral groups, one member appointed by the Dean, and one student appointed by the LAS Council in the manner determined by its members. The Committee shall elect its Chair from among its Faculty members.

2. Duties
   a. Prepare slates of candidates for all elections of members of the Faculty or other eligible persons to standing committees of the College.
   b. Advise the Dean on appointments of persons to fill temporary vacancies on standing committees.
c. Be available for consultation regarding other committee appointments.

d. Periodically review the size and composition of all standing committees and recommend needed changes to the Faculty.

3. Nomination and Elections

The Executive Committee shall advise the Dean on candidates for the Nominations Committee. Faculty members shall serve two-year staggered terms. Members representing even-numbered electoral groups shall be elected in even-numbered years and members representing odd-numbered groups in odd-numbered years. The Executive Committee shall present nominations for the elected faculty members of the Nominations Committee in the agenda for the last meeting of the Faculty for the academic year. Additional nominations, with the nominee’s consent, may be presented by petition signed by eight voting members submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty at least three calendar days before the election. Vacancies will be filled by a new election of a member to serve the balance of the original term.

H. Standing Committees

1. The standing committees shall be:
   a. Committee on Academic Standards
   b. Awards Committee
   c. Courses and Curricula Committee
   d. General Education Committee
   e. Honors Council
   f. Policy and Development Committee

2. Duties

   Each standing committee shall exercise responsibility for matters within its jurisdiction in accordance with the customs and traditions of the College. Each committee shall respond to instructions from the Faculty and requests from the Dean for advice and recommendations, but each committee shall be free to initiate consideration of any matter falling within its jurisdiction.

3. Membership

   Faculty members will normally serve staggered two-year terms. The number of Faculty members on each committee shall be determined by the Faculty on the recommendation of the Nominations Committee. Each standing committee may include up to four non-faculty members (undergraduate students, graduate students, Academic Professionals, Instructional Staff (including but not limited to Instructors and Lecturers) with full voting rights in the committee. Each committee will elect its own Chair annually. The Dean or a designee shall serve as an ex-officio member of all standing committees.

4. Nominations
The Nominations Committee will develop a slate of nominees for each standing committee. If possible, the nominees shall be members of the electoral groups they represent. However, if, after due diligence, the Nominations Committee cannot identify a suitable candidate or candidates from an electoral group, a substitute who is not a member of that group but is qualified to represent that group may be selected. In the absence of specific Faculty action, the Committee shall submit slates of candidates representative of the electoral groupings for standing committees without altering the size of any committee. Additional nominations, with the nominees' consent, may be presented by petition signed by eight voting members submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty at least three calendar days prior to the election.

5. Elections

   a. The Nominations Committee shall present nominations for the Faculty and non-faculty members for each standing committee in the agenda for the last meeting of the Faculty for the academic year.

   b. If the slate is rejected, the Nominations Committee will develop procedures for a contested election.

6. Vacancies.

   Vacancies occurring in the standing committees shall be filled by appointments made by the Dean with the advice of the Nominations Committee; such appointments shall be confirmed by vote of the Faculty at its next regular meeting.

VII. PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

The rules contained in the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the conduct of business by the Faculty in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not in conflict with these Bylaws or with the University Statutes.

VIII. AMENDMENT AND REVISION OF BYLAWS

A. Amendment

   1. Amendments to these Bylaws may be made at any regular meeting of the Faculty by two-thirds vote of the members present and voting, provided that the notice and agenda requirements detailed by Article V, Sections A.4 and A.6 have been met.

   2. Proposals for amendments to these Bylaws may be made by any voting member.

B. Revision

   At least every ten years the Dean shall appoint a committee to examine the Bylaws and propose such revisions as seem desirable. The Faculty Parliamentarian shall be invited to participate with the committee.
PROCEDURES FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTION
ON COURSES AND CURRICULA PROPOSALS

(Adopted by the Faculty of the College of LAS May 1, 1992)

Procedures by which the Executive Committee will act for the Faculty on recommendations by the Courses and Curricula Committee concerning academic programs and policy.

1. The Courses and Curricula Committee shall make program proposals and policy recommendations on matters within its jurisdiction to the Executive Committee for action on behalf of the Faculty.

2. The Courses and Curricula Committee shall make quarterly reports to all College instructional units identifying the courses it has approved and the program and policy recommendations it has made to the Executive Committee.

3. After each quarterly report has been given to instructional units by the Courses and Curricula Committee, a period of fifteen calendar days shall be allowed for comment by instructional units before the Executive Committee acts on recommendations of the Courses and Curricula Committee.

4. After the period for receiving comment from the instructional units, the Executive Committee a) may act on behalf of the Faculty and notify the Faculty of those actions at the next meeting, b) may return the recommendation to the Courses and Curricula Committee for further consideration, c) may place the recommendation on the agenda of the next regular Faculty meeting, or d) may call a special Faculty meeting to consider the recommendation.
PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR LIMITING THE NUMBER OF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS WHO MAY SERVE ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(Proposed by the Policy and Development Committee November 10, 1988)
(Adopted by the Faculty of the College of LAS February 16, 1989)

The Bylaws of the College state that ...“no more than two members of the Executive Committee shall be executive officers of schools, departments, or other units of instruction.” [VI.D.3.b].

The following guidelines should be followed:

Nomination and election of executive officers to the Executive Committee

1. Executive officers can be nominated for election to the Executive Committee provided that there is one or no incumbent executive officer. If there are two incumbent executive officers, nominations of executive officers will not be accepted.

2. If there is one [no] incumbent executive officer, then one [two] additional executive officer[s] may be elected. If more than one [two] executive officer[s] win[s] the election in his/her [their] electoral group, then the one [two] with the highest vote count[s] will assume the membership. In the other electoral group[s] in which an executive officer won the election, the candidate[s] with the second highest vote count will assume membership.

3. The Secretary of the Faculty will summarize the guidelines which apply to the current composition of the Executive Committee in the call for nominations on the ballot for election.

Appointment of a member of the Executive Committee as an executive officer

A member who is appointed as an executive officer may continue to serve if the resulting number of executive officers is two or less. If the appointment results in more than two executive officers, the member is not eligible to continue service on the Executive Committee.
EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS
(Proposed by the Policy and Development Committee April 27, 1988)
(Adopted by the Faculty of the College of LAS November 10, 1988)
(Revised by the Faculty of the College of LAS November 7, 2002)

INTRODUCTION

The University Statutes require periodic evaluation of various administrators including departmental chief executive officers, school directors, and college deans. The relevant sections of the Statutes are Article III, Sections 3.b. and 5.b. concerning the dean and school directors, and Article IV, Section 2.a. and 3.a. concerning chairpersons and heads.

The objectives of the review are to evoke constructive commentary about the administration of the unit; to assess administrative effectiveness in such areas as overall performance, methods and style; to provide the administrator being reviewed with useful information concerning working relationships and expectations within the unit; and to provide useful and trustworthy commentary to the next organizational level. The evaluation is conducted by an ad hoc evaluation committee that submits a report and recommendations to the reviewed administrator’s immediate superior as advice concerning the administrator’s continuance. The procedures described in the following guidelines are intended to provide the maximum opportunity to procure a satisfactory assessment for the dual purpose of self-improvement and continuance, and to do so in a way that does not impose cumbersome evaluation procedures on units with no problems.

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

A. Cyclical Evaluation.

1. An evaluation of the administrative work of each officer designated below shall be conducted at least every fifth year of his/her tenure unless the individual has submitted a resignation effective the following year. An evaluation of an executive officer at the departmental level may be conducted earlier than the fifth year of administrative tenure, if faculty within the unit present a request for an early evaluation to the Dean, and if the Dean decides that sufficient reason exists for such an evaluation; for departments within schools, such a request will be transmitted through the school director and will be accompanied by the school director’s recommendation. The officers within the College subject to this evaluation process are the following:

   a. at the departmental level - each chair or head of a department; or director of a center, program, or similar unit,

   b. at the school level - the director,

   c. at the college level - the dean.

2. The evaluation will be conducted by an ad hoc committee selected in the manner outlined below. Visiting faculty members in the unit will take no part in these activities.

   a. At the departmental level the evaluation committee, normally consisting of 3-5 individuals, will be elected from among and by the voting faculty of the academic unit.
For units at this level that have none or few of their own budgeted faculty (e.g., museums, centers), the executive committee or advisory committee of the unit will provide the Dean with a list of faculty members who are associated with that unit; in units that do not have an executive or advisory committee the executive officer will provide the Dean with such a list. The Dean will determine who is eligible to vote for evaluation committee members or to be elected as a member, and an evaluation committee, normally of 3-5 individuals, will be elected by and from that group. If an appropriate electorate cannot be identified, the Dean, in consultation with the unit, will appoint an evaluation committee.

b. At the school level the evaluation committee will consist of one representative from each department within the school, excluding executive officers, elected from among and by the faculty of that unit.

c. At the college level the evaluation committee will be elected from among and by the Faculty of the College with one representative selected from each electoral grouping within the College. Candidates may be nominated by a petition signed by eight members of the Faculty of the College and addressed to the Secretary of the Faculty who shall conduct the election. If at least two candidates from each electoral group are not produced by the nomination process, the faculty members of the College’s Committee on Committees will complete the slate.

d. Associate or assistant executive officers of a unit shall not be eligible to serve on committees evaluating the performance of the executive officer of that unit.

3. The chair of the evaluation committee will be selected in accordance with the following procedures. No executive officer of a unit at the departmental, school, or college level will be eligible for this function. The chair will be a voting member of the committee.

a. For departmental units, the Dean of the College, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the College, will submit a list of three candidates from outside the unit. From these candidates, the faculty of the unit will elect one as chair of the evaluation committee.

b. For the schools, the Dean of the College, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the College, will submit a list of three candidates from outside the school. From these candidates, the faculty of the school will elect one as chair of the evaluation committee.

c. For the College, the chair of the evaluation committee should normally be a faculty member holding the rank of full professor and whose primary appointment is in a different College. The chair is appointed by the Provost.

4. The committee will collect information, and assure its confidential treatment, from the unit’s faculty concerning their assessment of the executive officer’s performance. Written commentary will be invited, usually in the form of letters, although at the discretion of the committee a questionnaire can be submitted to all faculty of the unit; an opportunity should also be provided to faculty members who wish to meet with the committee or one of its members to provide oral commentary. Such inquiry should include attention to academic leadership, administrative skill, and general qualities. When appropriate, the committee may extend its data collection to knowledgeable individuals outside the unit under examination. The committee’s report should address the administrator’s effectiveness and stewardship, should include a recommendation about continuance, and should be submitted in writing to the immediate superior.
5. At the departmental level the evaluation committee shall invite the assistance of a graduate student representative selected by the evaluation committee from a list of three nominations presented from among and by the graduate students in the unit. The evaluation committee will prepare the charge to the graduate student representative and will determine the form of his or her participation. The student representative’s input shall be taken into account by the evaluation committee and shall be summarized in the following report. At the discretion of the evaluation committee, undergraduate opinion may be solicited, although the unit’s undergraduate program and the experience of the undergraduates should be considered as they bear on the administrative performance of the executive officer. The advice of non-tenure-track instructors, academic professionals, and staff may be solicited as deemed appropriate by the evaluation committee.

6. Once the administrative decision concerning continuance has been made, that conclusion and the supporting rationale will be communicated to the unit and its chief executive by the immediate superior.

B. Annual Reappointment of the Dean of the College.

When the College’s elected Executive Committee members convene to provide the Provost with advice on the reappointment of the Dean, they may solicit and consider the views of each departmental chief executive officer, school director, and such others of the constituency within the College as circumstances seem to warrant before submitting their recommendation.

C. Annual Reappointment of a Chair of a Department or Director of a School.

Before making any recommendation to the Chancellor on the annual reappointment of the Chair of a department, the Dean shall consult the Executive Committee of the department and the Director of any school containing the department. Likewise, before making any recommendation to the Chancellor on the annual reappointment of the Director of a school, the Dean shall consult the Executive Committee of the school.
LAS FACULTY APPEALS COMMITTEE PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

(Proposed by the Policy and Development Committee April 27, 1988)  
(Adopted by the Faculty of the College of LAS November 10, 1988)  
(Revised by the Faculty of the College of LAS November 7, 2002)

A. THE COMMITTEE

1. Responsibilities

   a. As an elected Committee of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Faculty Appeals Committee is responsible to the faculty of the College of LAS.

   b. As specified in the College of LAS Bylaws, the Faculty Appeals Committee will consider appeals of faculty personnel decisions made at the level of the Department, or comparable unit, the School, or the College, especially those that pertain to the following areas: rollbacks, promotion and/or tenure, sabbatical leaves, leaves of absence without pay, nonreappointment, and termination (section VI.E.2(a).) Excluded are appeals or any aspects of an appeal based solely on discrimination by reason of race, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, religion, age, handicap, or status as a disabled veteran or veteran of the Vietnam era; such appeals are to be handled by the University's Affirmative Action Office. An appeal may be brought simultaneously or subsequently to the LAS Faculty Appeals Committee and the Affirmative Action Office.

   c. In performing its functions, the Committee shall make such investigations and hold such consultations as it deems necessary to arrive at responsible recommendations consistent with the academic policies of the College and of the University.

2. Composition and Voting Procedures

   a. The LAS Faculty Appeals Committee shall consist of eight members of the rank of Associate Professor and above, one elected from each of the eight electoral groups in the College. No executive officer of any unit or serving member of the LAS Executive Committee may serve on the Committee. Each spring semester the Committee will elect a chair from among its continuing members. The Officer of the College who serves as liaison to the Committee will convene the initial meeting for the purpose of electing a chair.

   b. Electoral groups and election procedures shall be as specified in the College Bylaws.

   c. Five members shall constitute a quorum.

   d. A member shall be disqualified from participation in discussing and voting on a case involving an appellant from that member's Department, or comparable unit. The full Committee may also disqualify from participation in a case in which previous knowledge or involvement might reasonably be thought to prejudice their opinions.

   e. A majority of members present at a meeting and qualified to consider a case, according to Section A.2.d, above, are required to pass all motions pertaining to appeals. In the case of a tie vote, a motion fails.
f. The Chair, as an elected member, is entitled to vote on all motions, except as noted in Section A.2.d. above.

B. APPEALS PROCEDURES

1. Appeals of Decisions Made on the Department, School, or College Levels
   a. A faculty member who decides to appeal a personnel decision made by a Department (or comparable unit) or a School should ordinarily first follow the appeals procedures provided for in the bylaws of the unit which made that decision. Unless specified otherwise in these bylaws, this appeal should be made within thirty days after the faculty member is notified of the decision.
   b. A faculty member who decides to appeal a personnel decision made by the College should first appeal to the Executive Committee of the College through the executive officer(s) of his/her unit(s) or School within thirty days after notification of the decision.

2. Appeals to the LAS Faculty Appeals Committee
   a. A faculty member who is dissatisfied with the results of the first appeal to the unit, School, or College may appeal to the LAS Faculty Appeals Committee within thirty days of notification of that result.
   b. A written appeal can be directed to any member of the Committee. The appeal should contain a summary of evidence justifying the appeal and should state what prior appeals procedures (if any) have been followed. The appellant will supply a copy of the appeal to the executive officer(s) of the unit(s) which made the decision being appealed.
   c. Within 5 working days after receipt of an appeal, directly or forwarded by a Committee member, the Officer of the College who serves as liaison to the Committee will request a written summary of the reasons for the decision being appealed from the executive officer(s) of the unit(s) concerned. This summary must be sent to the liaison within 10 working days of the receipt of the request, and promptly provided by him or her, along with the appeal, to qualified (see A.2.d) committee members. A copy of this summary will be given to the appellant.
   d. Within reasonable time, the Committee will then meet to conduct an initial evaluation of the appeal. The appellant has the right to appear before the Committee at that time to make a statement and answer questions.
   e. If the Committee decides not to investigate the appeal further, it must communicate in writing the reasons for its decision to the appellant and the executive officer(s) concerned.
   f. If at least two members of the Committee eligible to consider the case believe that there is a basis for the appeal, the Committee will instruct the Chair either to (a) take up the matter with appropriate College authorities, or (b) appoint a case subcommittee from its membership which shall investigate the matter and report its findings and recommendations to the Committee.
   g. The case subcommittee will obtain all documents pertaining to the decision under appeal, and to all previous appeals of the decision from both the appellant and the executive officer(s) of the unit(s) involved. It may obtain whatever documentation it deems relevant from sources in the College as well as any
additional documentation from other sources it deems necessary. It may conduct whatever interviews it deems desirable. An appellant has the right to be fully apprised of evidence collected by the case subcommittee provided that anonymity of sources is preserved. When satisfied that enough information has been gathered and evaluated, the case subcommittee will report to the Committee with its recommendation(s), which may include minority reports.

h. The Committee shall review the case subcommittee report(s) and any other information it considers relevant, and may take one or more of the following actions:

i. Uphold the decision of the unit(s) concerned.

ii. Recommend to the governing body of the unit concerned that the decision be reconsidered within that unit.

iii. Arrange meetings with the appellant and/or executive officer(s) concerned to explore the possibilities of carrying out the Committee’s recommendation(s) in a way appropriate to the case and acceptable to the parties involved.

iv. Recommend that an appropriate body be appointed to conduct a new evaluation of the appellant’s entire performance. In such cases the Committee may propose the procedures for such an evaluation.

v. Take any other action(s) it deems necessary to be in the best interest of the College and the University and fair to the faculty member involved. Such actions may include specific recommendations about the case to the appropriate School, College, or University officers.

i. Any final Committee recommendation(s) must be made in writing to the appellant and to the executive officer(s) of the unit(s) concerned and must supply the basis and rationale for the recommendation(s). Copies must be sent to the Dean.
PROCEDURES FOR ACTION ON A UNIT'S REQUEST TO AFFILIATE/WITHDRAW FROM A SCHOOL

(Proposed at Faculty Meeting on January 25, 1983)
(Revised by the Faculty of the College of LAS November 7, 2002)
(Adopted by the Faculty of the College of LAS January 25, 1983)

BACKGROUND

In 1972, the Committee on Policy and Development recommended general adoption of an organizational pattern in which departmental units would be clustered within a relatively few schools so that the typical Dean-Department organization would be replaced by a Dean-School Director-Department pattern. Although implemented in part, we now have a structure which includes both large and small unschooled departments as well as three schools. The 1972 Committee recommended creation of a formal mechanism by which units would join or leave schools. The 1981-82 Policy and Development Committee called for "a clear, administratively sound procedure by which departments could opt for schooled or unschooled status." The relevant statement in its entirety may be helpful:

The entire matter of a department's relationship to the school of which it is a part needs clarification. The 1972 Committee on Policy and Development which recommended general adoption of a DSD structure for the College called for the creation of an established mechanism by which departments could join and leave schools. However, no such mechanism has been created and the department-school affiliation has been defined by practice rather than by policy. To have a mixed form of College organization involving both schooled and unschooled departments implies the need for a clear, administratively sound procedure by which departments could opt for schooled or unschooled status. Moreover, any such procedure would have to be so constructed so that stability would be preserved and that threats to withdraw from a school would not become the basis for bargaining and negotiation between department and school. The procedure should also be one that insulates the affiliation-withdrawal decision from highly specific, often transitory, conflicts. Unless a clear and carefully formulated procedure is adopted, the mixed-model of College organization may not work effectively in a setting that permits departments to withdraw from schools. Clarifying the status of the school-departments to withdraw from establishing procedures for affiliation-withdrawal would correct a defect in the present administrative system--regardless of how it may be working--and contribute to the long-term stability of the College as an integrated unit. (P&D Report, "An Analysis of Issues Concerning Dean-School-Department and Dean-Department Forms of LAS College Organization," February, 1982, p. 21.)

The P&D Report did not specifically mention the possibility of a withdrawal from one school to join another. Such a possibility might arise due to shifts in the disciplines, action of other units within the school or College, or creation a new school.

Each of the three existing schools has bylaws which initially were approved by the school faculty and provided as informational materials at the time the proposal to form the school was placed before the LAS Faculty.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

1. Creation or abolition of a school may, to quote the language of the Statutes, Article VIII, Creation of New Units, "be proposed by the Executive Committee and Dean of the College." Approval by the Senate and recommendation by the University Senates Conference, the Chancellor and the President of the Board of Trustees is required. (Proposals to extend this process to elimination of units have passed the UC Senate.)
2. However, a change in internal organization such as moving a unit into or out of an existing school within the College falls under the powers reserved for the College as under Article III, Section 2. c., "...the college shall have jurisdiction in all educational matters falling within the scope of its programs.... The college has the fullest measure of autonomy consistent with the maintenance of general University educational policy and correct academic and administrative relations with other divisions of the University" (pp. 11-12). Precedent suggests, however, that the Office of the Provost be notified of the change of organization.

PROPOSED PROCEDURE

It is recommended that the following procedures to govern unit association with or disassociation from a school within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences be adopted.

A. FOR A UNIT TO JOIN A SCHOOL

1. The unit, in accordance with its established procedures, should determine that it wishes to join a school. The request to affiliate with a school shall be transmitted to the Director of the School.

2. The School should act upon the request and, if favorable, shall transmit the request to the Dean for approval.

3. The Dean shall transmit the request to the Executive Committee for its recommendation. If approved by the Dean after consultation with the Executive Committee, the recommendation to make that change together with the recommendation of the Executive Committee shall be transmitted to the Provost.

B. FOR A UNIT TO LEAVE A SCHOOL

1. The unit, in accordance with its established procedures, should determine that it wishes to disassociate itself from a school. The request together with its supporting rationale shall be transmitted to the Dean of the College with a copy to the Director of the School.

2. The Dean shall then discuss the matter with the Director of the School and report his findings and other relevant material to the Executive Committee.

3. The School and its Director will then be asked for a response to and recommendation on the request and such other issues as may have been identified. (If the request is to transfer affiliation to another school, that school shall also be asked for a recommendation including the determination that the unit would be accepted as a member of the school if the request to leave the other school were granted.)

4. The unit requesting disassociation will be permitted an opportunity to comment on the response and recommendation of the School and its Director as outlined in step 3.

5. If approved by the Dean after consultation with the Executive Committee, the recommendation to make that change together with the recommendation of the Executive Committee shall be transmitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
UNIT TERMINATION

(Adopted by the Faculty of the College of LAS February 7, 1984)

BACKGROUND

The 1981-82 Policy and Development Committee was instructed to develop a set of procedures to employ in reviewing units subject to possible termination. The report, submitted in the Spring of 1982, was reviewed by the College Executive Committee which made a few minor changes in the procedures. The recommended procedures (without the introductory pages of the 1981-82 report) were submitted to the faculty for action in spring, 1983. The faculty voted to refer the matter back to the Policy and Development Committee with the request that units be asked to submit suggestions for changes in the report. A copy of the introductory pages of the report and the proposed procedures were distributed to all units in March with a call for response. Three letters were received by the Committee. Committee members also suggested revisions. The suggestions from units and Committee members were considered by the 1982-83 Policy and Development Committee and some revisions in the original report were adopted. These included lengthened time for unit response, protection for tenured faculty if units are retrenched, and a recommendation that the entire report be made available to all LAS faculty members as part of a request for action. The Committee views the introductory section of the 1981-82 document as integral to the procedures in the sense of providing the history and framework within which the evaluation would function.

The remainder of this report is the work of the 1981-82 Policy and Development Committee with revisions in procedures adopted by the 1982-83 Committee. These include additions and minor changes in the procedures section proposed by the Executive Committee.

The Dean’s charge to the 1981-82 Policy and Development Committee called for a recommendation regarding procedures for unit elimination in the College. The Committee found this a charge with extensive implications for the College; consequently, its discussions focused not only on specific procedures but also involved issues implied by the perceived need to employ program elimination to address budgetary problems of the College. This report includes the Committee’s views concerning these larger issues as well as its specific recommendations for procedures to be followed in unit termination. The report is organized into three sections: (1) the role of unit elimination as a tool of budgetary control, (2) criteria for program and unit evaluation, and (3) procedures for unit termination.

THE ROLE OF UNIT TERMINATION AS A COLLEGE BUDGETARY CONTROL STRATEGY

The Committee is agreed that the primary bases for program continuation should be need and quality within the mission of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. With societal and disciplinary changes and with developments in educational technology, educational systems will undergo change over time. This may involve termination of units made obsolete or ineffective. The need to be responsibily adaptive to social, educational, and technological developments thus makes necessary adoption of procedures for program evaluation and, if appropriate, unit termination.

The exigency created by a deteriorating budgetary situation in the College is another source of perceived need for procedures for unit elimination. Great care and deliberation must characterize the use of unit termination as a mechanism of budgetary control: indeed, unit elimination should not be considered a primary means to achieve that goal. The Committee wishes to underscore the need for developing mechanisms of budgetary control within the College that can assure program quality without resort, except in the most extreme cases, to unit termination for essentially financial reasons. Administrators at all levels must give
attention to the development and implementation of procedures by which units themselves can identify nonessential aspects of their programs which could be terminated without seriously damaging the integrity of core components of the unit’s structure. In most units some programs or operations are central and essential. Other programs and operations are more peripheral, but it may be useful and desirable to maintain at least some of them. We see two problems that need to be addressed: (1) developing administrative procedures by which such nonessential programs and operations within units can be identified for elimination or curtailment, and (2) developing mechanisms for rewarding units for eliminating or curtailing such programs within the context of college needs, budgetary or otherwise. Without such actions the College may have little recourse in times of major budgetary constriction other than unit elimination or across-the-board cuts damaging the quality of important and essential programs.

Thus, the Committee recognizes unit and program termination as an appropriate means of accommodation to changing academic perceptions. Termination may also serve as a device of budgetary control, but only in the most extreme cases and with the greatest attention possible to the need for and quality of the unit’s programs and to the protection of the professional careers of tenured faculty in the unit. Moreover, we urge primary reliance on mechanisms of budgetary control short of unit termination, including those requiring the development of procedures for identifying programs and operations for termination within units. Even where it is judged that a specific unit should be eliminated, attention must be given to maintaining components of the unit’s programs and operations that contribute importantly to the College’s mission. Administrative realignment, program consolidation, and the like generally will better serve the College than total elimination of a unit’s programs.

We also recommend that the College exercise leadership with the Campus and University administrations to foster procedures that offer promise for long-term amelioration of budgetary problems. The Committee is not committed to any particular policies, but we believe that if we are not to face excessive reliance on program termination as a means of budgetary control, long-range solutions need to be developed. We urge the College administration to lead the way in promoting consideration of long-range options to secure flexible budget control.

**CRITERIA FOR UNIT TERMINATION IN THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES**

The Committee discussed at length criteria to be employed in unit and program evaluation. It is our belief that in making decisions regarding unit elimination, it will be necessary, inevitably, to make cross-unit comparisons. However, only criteria germane to the specific unit should be employed in making an initial evaluation of a unit and its program. Thus, for instance, with an academic unit, the appropriate criteria will reflect comparison with other units at comparable universities in the specific discipline. We recognize that after such evaluation is made, the administrative decision regarding continuation or termination necessarily will involve a more general judgment of the need and value of the unit’s programs and operations within the mission of the College as a whole. So that we do not lose sight of our shared general goals in discussion of unit termination, indeed in all discussions of academic policy, we urge the Dean and faculty to articulate the philosophy and mission of the College.

The Committee also discussed the general categories of evaluation that ought to be employed in evaluating units. The Committee strongly believes that the process of identifying a specific unit for possible termination should be based on the systematic application of evaluative criteria and that in order to protect against happenstance identification of units for possible termination, the College should consider the development of an on-going review process. There is a feeling that the present COPE procedures are inadequate and that consideration should be given to the College’s implementation of its own review procedures. Indeed, the development of systematic review procedures is essential if caprice is to be avoided in identifying units for possible termination.
In regard to the general categories of evaluation that ought to be employed in unit review, the primary criteria should concern the need, appropriateness, and centrality of the unit’s programs and operations to the accomplishment of the LAS College mission. Thus, a unit judged to be of poor quality should be strengthened rather than eliminated if it is important to the accomplishment of the College mission. If a unit is judged not essential to the fulfillment of the College mission, the next most important criteria should concern the quality of programs and operations. Obviously, depending on the character and mission of the unit, the criteria relevant to specific programs and operations will differ.

In addition to criteria concerning the unit’s relevance to the LAS mission and the quality of its programs and operations, other appropriate criteria include considerations of societal and educational demand, the availability of similar programs within the Illinois higher education system, service value to other units within the College and University, and cost-efficiency of the programs and operations.

**PROCEDURE FOR REVIEW OF A UNIT FOR POSSIBLE TERMINATION**

The Committee's aim in developing procedures for review of a unit designated for possible termination were to (1) assure the fairness and integrity of the evaluation process, (2) establish appropriate faculty involvement in decision-making, (3) permit decisions to be made in a reasonable time frame, and (4) safeguard the rights of the individuals in the designated units.

**Introduction**

The primary bases for program continuation should be need and quality within the mission of the College. With societal and disciplinary changes and developments in educational technology, educational systems undergo change over time. This results in reorganization or, occasionally, termination of programs or units rendered obsolete or ineffective. Consideration of a unit for possible elimination might arise out of concerns of school directors, the Dean, or internal reviews or from sources external to the College such as other administrators or review committees. The suggestion for such a review would undoubtedly be based upon a number of factors which might include cost of instruction, shifts in enrollment, changes in disciplinary structures, shifts in missions and responsibilities, quality indicators, or a critical financial situation for the College as a whole.

Whatever the reason for review, undertaking the review must not be viewed as tantamount to a decision to eliminate the unit and thus jeopardize the unit’s standing in terms of faculty and student retention and recruitment or its standing in the university community and discipline. Therefore, the evaluation must be thorough but rapid and involve factors internal to the unit while also analyzing that unit within the context of the educational policy of the College and the campus. A review might result in various decisions, e.g., to restructure; to transfer, limit or terminate some/all programs; to add needed resources.

The following criteria should determine the ultimate decision:

1. Need, appropriateness, and centrality of the unit to the LAS College mission.

2. Quality of unit programs and operations.

3. Additional factors such as:
   a. societal and educational demand
   b. service value to other units within the College and university
   c. cost/benefits and efficiency of programs and operations
   d. availability of similar program within the system of Illinois public higher education
**Procedure**

The following procedures shall govern the review of units subject to possible termination within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

1. A Unit Review Committee (URC) shall be established to review each designated unit.

2. With the advice of the Executive Committee, the Dean may constitute and charge the unit review committee. For a unit within the school, the dean shall also seek the advice of the school director.
   a. The committee shall consist of 5-7 members appointed by the dean with the advice of the Executive Committee from a larger panel nominated by the Committee on Committees. The unit under review shall have the option of designating one of the members of the URC from the panel proposed by the Committee on Committees.
   b. No member of the unit under review shall serve on the URC.

3. The URC shall make a recommendation to the Dean regarding continuation, restructuring, or termination of the unit.
   a. The URC may use special internal and/or external review committees to assess various components of the unit. Such Committees shall make specific assessments as needed by the URC. No recommendations regarding the continuation of the unit may be made in these assessments.
   b. In cases where an academic (degree-granting) unit is being reviewed, the judgment of an external review panel must be considered as part of the URC evaluation.
      1. This external review panel shall consist of at least three scholars of national stature within the discipline(s) under review. The unit under review shall nominate at least two such scholars and at least one member of this panel shall be selected from among individuals nominated by the unit.
      2. The external review panel is not used to make a judgment about continuation. Its function is to make judgments of quality, program and operational strengths and weaknesses, etc. (While it may be necessary or useful to bring the panelists to campus, their functions could be accomplished through consideration of materials supplied to them. The review may involve consultation among the panelists or consist of independent assessments by the panelists.)
   c. Before arriving at the final recommendation, the URC shall formulate and provide the unit with a list of questions and a bill of particulars of concerns or possible deficiencies relative to the unit. The unit shall have at least 20 working days to make a response to the URC.
   d. After considering the response of the unit, the URC shall arrive at its recommendations and transmit those recommendations along with the supporting rationale and materials to the Dean. (Copy to the school director for units within schools.)
   e. Although the time consumed may vary, under most circumstances the URC should complete its evaluations and recommendations within three months of receiving its charge.
4. The Executive Committee shall review the recommendations and materials and formulate its advice to the Dean relative to the URC’s recommendations. (For units within schools, the Dean shall also seek the advice of the school director.)

5. The Dean shall make a recommendation relative to the unit. A range of options is available including continuation of all operations, termination of some components, transfer of programs or personnel to other units, termination of the unit. In no event shall a tenured faculty member's employment be involuntarily terminated due to the retrenchment of a unit. Rather, the Dean shall ensure a suitable alternate academic assignment for tenured faculty acceptable to those involved. Such recommendations shall be implemented in accordance with the Statutes and established procedures and personnel policies of the college, the campus and the university.
POLICY ON PERIODIC REVIEW OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS
(Proposed by the Policy and Development Committee April 27, 1988)
(Adopted by the Faculty of the College of LAS November 10, 1988)
(Revised by the Faculty of the College of LAS November 7, 2002)

Campus policy (Provost’s Communication No. 21) requires that “every tenured or tenure-track faculty member should be reviewed annually” through written procedures adopted by the unit. These procedures must comply with the requirements of Communication No. 21, including one that units provide an “Option for Periodic Broader Review” which may be invoked by the unit executive officer or a faculty member from time to time, but no more frequently than once every five years.

Thus, any Associate Professor may request his/her primary department to consider the case for promotion to Professor, including the solicitation of external peer reviews of scholarly activities, following the established procedures of the department under the broader review option and in accordance with the criteria for promotion set forth in Provost’s Communication No. 9.

Stated simply, this policy provides an additional recourse for an Associate Professor who believes that consideration for promotion has been inappropriately slow. The responsibility for weighing the merits of the case, and for deciding on whether or not to recommend promotion, still rests with the department. That is, a department has no a priori commitment to recommend promotion for an Associate Professor who has requested an evaluation mandated by this policy. Moreover, the five-year interval applies only to a required evaluation: an Associate Professor may request an evaluation, and his/her department may recommend promotion, at any appropriate time. And finally, an Associate Professor who is dissatisfied with the departmental promotion decision, based either on a mandated or voluntary review, may still bring his/her case to the Faculty Appeals Committee in the usual manner.
POLICIES APPROVED
BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE COLLEGE

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
POLICY ON LEAVES WITHOUT PAY

(Endorsed by the Executive Committee)
(Approved by the Dean September 18, 1990)

Please refer to Section IX/C-38 of the Campus Administrative Manual, which covers general principles and procedures governing leaves without pay. College policy is concordant with campus policy in all respects.

Any request for leave without pay from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences must receive the approval of the executive officer of the corresponding unit, the director of the appropriate school (if applicable), the Dean of the College, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The guiding principle for approval is that the best interests of the University can be reasonably considered to be served by granting the leave; hence any request for approval must be accompanied by justification. Executive officers are asked to pay particular attention to point (2) in the attachment in justifying their approval to the College.

A request for leave without pay from a member who accepts a tenured position in another university will be given particularly close scrutiny. Approval may be granted, but only after the decision to accept the outside offer has been made, and only after the member seeking the leave and the executive officer of the unit provide justification, in separate letters to the Dean, that the University’s interests are served by granting leave. The leave will not be granted unless there is a realistic prospect of return.

In no case will a second year of leave be granted to a person who has left the University to accept appointment in a tenured post elsewhere. Other requests for leaves extending beyond one year will be considered within the provisions of the campus policy.
GUIDELINES CONCERNING
CASES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

(Endorsed by the Executive Committee)
(Approved by the Dean May 14, 1992)

These guidelines are supplementary to Communications No. 9 and 10 from the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. They are meant to provide advice concerning factors that the Executive Committee and the Dean regard as especially important in the consideration of a case for promotion or tenure in the units of the College, and in the presentation of that case for review at higher levels. This document is addressed principally to executive officers, but others involved in the review and preparation of promotion cases will find it useful.

1. General comments. When you begin a mandated review of an assistant professor (i.e. one having tenure code 6), you should furnish him or her with copies of Communication No. 9 and this document. By so doing, you can ensure that everyone has a clear view of procedures and the grounds for decisions. A review undertaken before the candidate's tenure code reaches 6 may be handled less formally. See Section 7 below.

By College policy, any associate professor will receive, upon request, a full review of his or her case for promotion, if more than six years have elapsed since the time of the last full review. Each department is urged to consider the records of its associate professors in a systematic fashion, so that members are not left unjustly in rank simply from inaction.

2. Requests for outside letters. In soliciting letters of evaluation from authorities outside the University, please avoid any commentary that suggests a desired response. You may make an initial contact by telephone to ask if the referee is available to undertake the evaluation, but you may not indicate any local disposition regarding the case to the referee, and you may not pursue any line of conversation that leads toward a judgment of the reviewee's achievements and personal qualities. The same is true of the letter that you use to make the formal request for an evaluation from anyone outside the campus.

Each unit is permitted to develop its own language for this letter, although two inclusions are now required by the College.

a. The following sentence must be included at a convenient point in your text:

The Dean of our college requests that you provide, in addition to your own comments about this case, the names of two or three other authorities who might be consulted about it.

b. The following paragraph must be included to address our position on confidentiality:

The policy of the University of Illinois is to hold in confidence all letters of evaluation from persons outside the institution. Only the committees and administrative officers directly responsible for the decision of concern here will have access to your letter. It will not be provided to the person on whom you comment unless we are required specifically and legally to do so.

A copy of your standard letter requesting external evaluations must be included with the papers supporting any recommendation for promotion or tenure. This requirement is a part of VCAA Communication No. 9.

Please make it clear in your letter of request that a primary concern is the progress of the candidate in the recent past. For an assistant professor, this period ordinarily coincides
with the time of appointment to our faculty, but it might encompass a few earlier years, if, for example, we had hired the candidate, from a faculty position elsewhere, only a year or two before the evaluation. In the case of an associate professor who is evaluated for promotion, the focus should be on progress since the granting of tenure. If the review requires that each reviewer comment on particular written material, please send the material to the reviewer together with your letter of charge. Do not wait for the reviewer to request the material. We have often received reviews that have focused on the distant past, because the reviewer was sent nothing specific and concentrated subsequently on what he or she could recall easily.

Your letter of request should be accompanied by a fresh CV and publication list for the candidate. Reviewers also seem to find useful a brief summary of the candidate’s view of his or her major accomplishments in research, so the College recommends that you ask the candidate to prepare such a statement in time for inclusion with these mailings. The same statement can be used later as the candidate’s evaluative statement of research in the promotion papers. In the case of an "early" evaluation of an assistant professor, it may be unnecessary or undesirable to ask the candidate to prepare such a statement for inclusion with the letter of request. Reasons for this variation are provided in Section 7.

In requesting external evaluations, please provide enough lead time for the reviewers to examine the written materials with appropriate care.

3. **Conflicts of interest.** An important principle in preparing a case for review is to avoid conflicts of interest. Opportunities for conflict frequently present themselves in the selection of external reviewers. To reinforce the Vice Chancellor’s language on this point, the following passage from Communication No. 9 is reproduced here:

   **Letters from colleagues/collaborators, former professors, mentors, and by persons of lower rank than the recommended rank of the candidate will very likely be discounted by the Committee on Promotions and Tenure as containing bias. Letters from such individuals are discouraged.**

The definition of "colleagues/collaborators" is open to some uncertainty. The guiding principle is to avoid recourse if the reviewer stands to benefit from the success of the reviewee. In general, one could expect that this would be true if the two shared a common grant, were close collaborators on a common project, had coauthored articles or books, or the like. This phrase is not meant to exclude colleagues who have knowledge of the reviewee from ordinary professional contact in a community of scholars.

It is not appropriate to argue that a person cannot be evaluated except by a very small community, all of whom have a demonstrable conflict of interest of the kind described here. Scholarship of the quality that is to be recognized by promotion and tenure in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is expected to have substantial impact; thus it must affect a community substantially larger than this sort of argument can admit.
4. **Choice of referees from peer institutions.** Communication No. 9 from the VCAA indicates that

   **The outside evaluators should be chosen from institutions the department uses as peer institutions for other reviews such as salary comparisons. If the evaluator is not from such an institution, please explain why not in the description of the evaluator.**

In the College and campus committees, this matter is taken seriously. There are very good reasons for choosing evaluators from peer (or better) institutions, the principal ones being that such persons are more likely than others to share our standards for promotion and tenure and to understand the environment for scholarship that exists here. If the evaluator's institution is not obviously a peer or better, please address the basis for your selection clearly in the manner requested in Communication No. 9.

The use of evaluators from industry or commerce, government agencies, or national laboratories is discouraged for the reasons that underlie this provision. If such a person is used, his or her letter should not be part of the minimal group of three required in VCAA Communication No. 9, and a clear statement should be made in the statement of his or her qualifications about the evaluator's knowledge of academic institutions.

5. **Role of the candidate in selecting outside reviewers.** Within the provisions of Communication No. 9, the candidate is granted the privilege of suggesting names of qualified external evaluators. He or she should be advised of the points covered here in Sections 3 and 4 before his or her suggestions are furnished to the department.

The candidate's list must include enough names to guarantee some degree of privacy to the external evaluators. That is, the names must not be so few, or the list so structured, that the candidate can, in effect, direct the inquiry toward particular individuals. College policy requires that a majority of the external evaluations come from the department's, rather than the candidate's, nominations. These provisions suggest, in combination, that the unit request four to eight names from the candidate, that it solicit opinions from two or three of the candidate's choices, and that it obtain a slightly larger number of opinions from others.

Communication No. 9 is silent on the candidate's privilege of vetoing external reviewers. College policy is that the candidate may not be granted such a privilege unconditionally. Some units allow the candidate to indicate individuals whom he or she believes to be irrationally biased. This practice is permitted, although the candidate cannot reasonably request avoidance of more than one or two individuals. It is the unit's responsibility to consider each such request seriously, but the unit is not bound to honor the request. If the questioned evaluator's opinion is deemed particularly relevant to the case, the unit may solicit an opinion.

6. **Evaluation of teaching.** The evaluation of teaching continues to present difficulty, and it will probably give rise to further revisions in the relevant sections of VCAA Communication No. 9 as techniques for approaching it become better refined. Experience to date suggests that the most useful evaluative statement is one prepared by a team of two or three able teachers who have examined the reviewee's teaching materials and have attended some classes. This mode of evaluation, already used in some departments, is encouraged further.

In any case, the evaluation of teaching must be made with appropriate breadth and depth. Not useful are a few selected quotations from the backs of ICES forms. The reviewing committees have no basis for judging the frequency of favorable remarks or the degree to which they might be counterbalanced, or even overwhelmed, by critical comments. It is
important to include some judgment from the faculty, not students alone. Moreover, this judgment should be based on reviews of particular aspects of teaching performance, not hearsay.

Please pay careful attention to the structure of your responses on teaching. Section III.A.1 is meant to be a simple description (without evaluation) of the candidate’s teaching activities. Section IV.A.1 is intended to include evaluative statements. The relationship between these sections is parallel with that between Sections III.B and IV.B, which deal with research and scholarship.

7. **Consideration of assistant professors with tenure code less than 6.** The "early" consideration of assistant professors for promotion and tenure presents some hazards and must be carried out with delicacy. The term "early" here is meant only to designate a review that occurs before it is actually mandated by the University’s regulations; it does not imply a reluctance by the College or the campus to consider such a case.

The hazards arise from the fact that the early consideration of a candidate will produce a picture of scholarship and teaching that is necessarily less complete than a review conducted at a later stage. In some instances, the case may be compelling even at the early stage. In others, the reviewing committees can judge that the decision to grant promotion and tenure is best deferred. If this judgment is reached after involving the candidate emotionally in the process, it can lead to disappointment and disaffection that ultimately damages a department’s interests. It is particularly egregious to incur this problem with an early promotion case, because a department normally undertakes the review only when it regards the candidate as especially meritorious. Thus a highly valued member becomes alienated, if the process is not handled carefully.

Any department undertaking a review of this kind must recognize that it cannot forfeit its freedom to defer the case simply out of fear of offending the candidate, nor can it expect the College and campus committees to forfeit their duty to conduct a serious review of actions in the department or school. Therefore, the department owes to itself the avoidance of any inappropriate implication of success to the candidate.

A case for early promotion may be developed in a manner identical to that used where the review is mandated. On the other hand, such a case should be compelling; therefore it ought to be sustainable on the basis of information collected without extensive involvement of the candidate. The department may begin its review with discreet requests for external letters without seeking names of reviewers from the candidate. If the results are encouraging toward the promotion, the department may involve the candidate by asking for his or her suggestions of reviewers in the usual manner, so that additional reviews may be obtained. If promotion papers are eventually assembled for consideration at the College and campus levels, the candidate should be invited to contribute the usual statements on teaching and research.

There may be revisions of this advice from time to time. For the present, a most important point is to avoid raising inappropriate expectations. If the candidate is deeply involved in the process, it will be necessary to caution him or her that the granting of tenure implies a very sizable commitment of resources by the University and will therefore be considered seriously at all levels.

8. **Criteria and votes.** Communication No. 9 contains a general discussion on the criteria for promotion and tenure. One of the purposes of this section is to focus attention on principal issues for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Tenure has consequences of long life and great magnitude, and it should be awarded only when it is clearly in the best interest of the University of Illinois to do so. This is the
overriding criterion. Several questions ought to be asked in making the test. First is whether the candidate would improve the overall quality of the unit’s tenured staff. Second is whether the unit is better able to improve itself by granting promotion and tenure or by hiring afresh. Third is whether the candidate is likely to maintain his or her quality and his or her contributions to the unit (or improve them) over the long period typically involved in a tenured appointment. The department, the College, and the University ought not accept a lifetime obligation if there is substantial doubt on these points.

Votes on tenure often seem to be based on uncertain criteria, because the meaning and implications of the vote frequently remain unstated in specific terms. To sharpen the issues in a tenure case, you are urged to pose the following specific affirmation as the basis for the vote:

The candidate has made contributions of appropriate magnitude and quality in research and teaching, and has demonstrated a high likelihood of sustaining contributions to the field and to the department; therefore the granting of indefinite tenure is judged to be in the best interest of the University of Illinois.

A vote on promotion of an associate professor should be based on a similar affirmation:

Since the last promotion, the candidate has made contributions of appropriate magnitude and quality in research and teaching, and has demonstrated the ability to sustain contributions to the field and to the department; therefore the granting of promotion is in the best interest of the University of Illinois.

The required vote of record must not be taken until all evaluative materials involved in a case have been received and considered by the voting members. Normally, those voting on the case should have access to the names and qualifications of the outside evaluators and to complete, unedited copies of their letters.

Any member of the College who reads these letters is obligated by our clearly stated pledge to maintain confidentiality. (See Section 2 above.) It is unethical to disclose to the candidate, or to any person not directly involved in the decision concerning promotion, any material that can reveal the identity of any evaluator. The executive officer is responsible for reminding members within a unit of their obligations in this respect, and the Dean is responsible for reminding participants in the review at the College level.

9. Preparation of papers. Effort in the preparation of papers should be devoted to the sections in which there is really something to say. Do not feel that sections must be occupied with persuasive language simply because they exist. In LAS, matters such as continuing education and even local service are frequently inapplicable to a given case. If so, leave the related sections blank or say little.

Among the items for which the unit is responsible, the Executive Committee of the College typically finds the following sections of greatest importance in the evaluation of a case:

- III.B. Research, Creative and Other Scholarly Activities (lists of publications, grants, fellowships, prizes, awards, editorships, and theses supervised)
- IV.A.1. Resident Instruction (particularly the description of teaching activities and the evaluation of effectiveness)
- IV.B. Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities (evaluations of most significant publications and research accomplishments)
VI. Names, affiliations, and qualifications of external evaluators

VII. Special comments by the unit executive officer

Please take special care in the preparation of these sections. The evaluative statements should be economical and to the point.

Many sets of papers do not include adequate information in Item VI. This material is regarded as very important by review committees. Please attend carefully to it.

Item VII, the commentary by the unit executive officer, is read as a summary of the case. It should contain a brief restatement of strengths, and it should address forthrightly any negative features that make themselves obvious in the letters or elsewhere. If a subcommittee of the unit has reported formally on the case, the salient points of the report should be summarized. **If the recommendation involves the granting of tenure, this statement should indicate clearly why the department will be strengthened by such a commitment to the candidate and why the best interests of the University will be served.**

The College Executive Committee will welcome an explanatory note about conventions used to ascribe authorship in the candidate’s field. The concern is in being able to distinguish the principal author, if one exists, in a string of authors, particularly for an article or chapter. Of course, the ultimate goal is to be able to discern the contributions of the candidate in collaborative works. If you can make useful comments about this point, please make them in Item VII.

The Executive Committee and the Dean agree that promotion recommendations are typically far too long. Please do everything you can to confine comments from the candidate and the department to a reasonable length. A promotion that is truly warranted is readily justified in a few pages. Very long justifications suggest weakness and become counterproductive. Microscopic fonts earn a special disfavor. It is not necessary to anticipate and to address every conceivable question. If particular questions are raised at the College or campus levels, the unit will be given an opportunity to answer them.

10. Checklist. Promotion and tenure papers have a high official status, and very important decisions with legal consequence depend on them. As an institution, we must enforce a high standard of consistency in the preparation of these papers. Much effort is wasted each year because papers must be partly redone to conform with standard practice. Nearly all of it could be avoided. Attachment X to VCAA Communication No. 9 is a checklist for the preparation of papers. Please ask the person who prepares the papers in your unit to refer carefully to it at all stages in the process. If questions arise, please contact Paula Hays at 3-1350 before propagating an error through all copies of your papers.

11. **Sequence of events beyond the unit’s decision.** All promotion and tenure cases are reviewed by the Executive Committee of the College before the middle of December. A formal vote will be taken by secret ballot on each of them. The Dean formulates his or her recommendation to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on the basis of the debate within the Executive Committee, over whose meetings he or she presides. By the end of December, all units will receive notice from the Dean on actions in the College. The executive officers of the units are encouraged to pass along notice of the action in the College. The candidates, but together with a clear indication that further review at the campus level is required. That review is done in the spring semester and is normally not completed until late April. When the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs notifies the College, the Dean will in turn notify the executive officers of the Vice Chancellor’s decision. Final action by the Board of Trustees comes in mid-summer.
12. **Negative decisions at the unit level.** If a unit decides negatively in a tenure case, a very formal notification must be given to the candidate. Please refer carefully to VCAA Communication No. 10, if this happens in your unit. In addition, please notify the Dean informally before providing the formal letter to the candidate. If you have any questions about procedures, consult with the College office before acting.
POLICIES ON THE RECRUITMENT OF NEW FACULTY MEMBERS

(Endorsed by the Executive Committee)
(Approved by the Dean August 27, 1991)

Authorization for search and approval of procedure. Any search for a new member of the Faculty in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences must be authorized by the Dean. The procedures to be used in advertising the search and in interviewing candidates must be approved in advance by the College Equal Employment Opportunity Officer.

Extension of an offer. When a final choice is made in a search, and a unit desires to extend an offer, the executive officer of the unit in which the appointment is to be made must seek the approval of both the College EEO Committee and the Dean. If the unit lies in a school, the school director's approval must be gained before the College-level approvals are sought.

In no case is the formal letter of offer to be issued by the executive officer of the unit in which the appointment would lie. After the required approvals have been obtained, an offer letter may be issued by the administrative officer immediately above the unit in which the appointment is to be made. For units in schools, this person is the school director. For all other units, including the schools themselves, it is the Dean of the College.

In the case of a joint appointment, the reviewing officer has the duty to ascertain that the proposed arrangement has the approval of the executive officers of all units in which formal appointments would be made. When the approval is sought from the Dean, a clear statement should be made about the division of teaching load among participating units. This statement will be used by the College to resolve any dispute that might arise with respect to obligations in future years.

The College's principal standard letters of offer (differing in their handling of tenure) are phrased as invitations, because the appointment is ultimately dependent on approval by the Board of Trustees. The letters cover a number of important legal points, but does not include a delineation of teaching responsibilities, moving costs, or setup arrangements. It is expected that the executive officer principally supervising the recruitment will write a more personal letter in which such matters would be defined.

There is alternate language to cover an appointment with an initial tenure code above 1. It will be substituted into the letter of invitation from the College if needed.

If an appointee is not a citizen of the United States, a visa that permits employment must be obtained before the appointment can be made effective. It is the employing unit's responsibility to attend to this point.

Extension of an offer at a senior level. To extend an offer at a faculty rank above assistant professor, other approvals, based on fuller documentation, are required. In addition to those discussed above, reviews must be undertaken by the Executive Committee of the College, the Dean, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs seeks counsel from the Vice Chancellor for Research. No offer can be extended until all approvals are received. This is necessarily a lengthier process than that required for the development of an offer at the level of assistant professor or lower. Please help your candidates to understand this point as you negotiate with them. Ordinarily, the reviews can be carried out in two weeks, but in some cases slightly more time is needed.

For appointments that would carry tenure, the Executive Committee, the Dean, and the Vice Chancellors require evidence justifying tenure that is comparable to the evidence required internally for the granting of tenure. The important elements are:
a. A statement from the executive officer that summarizes the strengths of the case, addresses any weaknesses apparent in the supporting material, and explains why the appointment will strengthen the unit.

b. The vote of the body that would normally review promotion and tenure cases in the unit.

c. A fresh *curriculum vitae* and list of publications.

d. Evaluative evidence concerning the nominee's effectiveness as a teacher.

e. The full set of letters from authorities who can evaluate the nominee's scholarship for impact and quality.

f. A copy of the letter used to solicit external letters of evaluation. This letter should contain the required language discussed in the College's *Guidelines Concerning Cases for Promotion and Tenure*.

g. Descriptions of the qualifications of the external reviewers.

h. Identification of the reviewers as selected by the nominee or by the unit.

The set of external letters must be obtained, at least in part, by solicitation from the unit, not by the nominee. This point can be clarified by reference to the usual situation in which these guidelines apply, viz. the recruitment of a senior appointee from outside the University. If a unit recommends such an appointment on the basis of an open search, some of the letters normally would be obtained upon the candidate's direct request to the evaluator. It is acceptable to include such letters in the supporting documents (even though it would not be satisfactory to do so in a local promotion case); however among the external letters ought to be a majority that were sought by the unit without the candidate's intervention. In other words, the candidate is not to be allowed to manage these reviews entirely.

The College’s *Guidelines Concerning Cases for Promotion and Tenure* relate to the preparation of internal promotion and tenure papers, but they convey the intent of the policies that govern the preparation of a case of this kind. If one remains faithful to their intent, one will arrive at a valid set of documents for review of a proposed appointment at a senior level.

Please place any recommendation concerning salary and other financial matters, such as proposed arrangements for financing startup costs, in a separate letter to the Dean (via the school director, if appropriate). The Executive Committee does not review financial arrangements for individuals. To protect privacy, the College office must delete such material out of documents used for general review.
POLICY ON AUTHORIZATION FOR TRAVEL

(Endorsed by the Executive Committee)
(Approved by the Dean August 27, 1991)

Policies concerning travel are detailed in Section 15-1A-200 of the University's "Regulations, Policy, and Guidelines." The general policy states that the heads of academic and administrative units have the authority to grant permission for their faculty and staff to travel, and that colleges may, at their option, require additional approvals.

In the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the authorization of travel is left to the executive officers of the academic or administrative units. If a unit lies within a school, the school director may determine the policy for the school.

No extraordinary approval is required for travel outside the United States. Some years ago, campus policies required a college dean's approval on all overseas travel, but this is no longer true.

The Dean is directly responsible for authorizing travel only by faculty and staff who are appointed in the College, but not in any academic or administrative subunit within the College. In addition, the Dean has direct authority over travel by school directors and the executive officers of academic and administrative units that are not organized into schools.

The director of a school is responsible for authorizing travel by faculty and staff who are appointed in the school, but not in an academic or administrative unit within the school. In addition, the director has authority over travel by the executive officers of academic or administrative units in the school.

For those faculty and staff members whose travel falls under the Dean's direct authority, the following policy applies:

Permission to travel is required in advance only when one or more of four conditions remains unsatisfied:

a. The travel meets a legitimate interest of the University.

b. The travel can be financed from a budget for which the traveller is responsible.

c. Responsible arrangements can be made for coverage of the traveller's local duties while he or she is absent.

d. The travel involves absence for no more than five full business days.

Prior approval, if required, should be sought from the Dean via a letter detailing the purpose, proposed financing, proposed arrangements for covering duties, and the duration of the trip. If the trip is undertaken without approval in advance, any request for reimbursement is subject to review for legitimacy under conditions (a)-(d). This policy covers all travel, including travel financed from University accounts, travel financed by persons or institutions outside the University, and vacation travel. In the case of vacation travel, condition (a) is waived.

Prior approval is not required for travel undertaken at personal expense during a period when the traveller is not under contract with the University, but it is required if the travel is to be financed from a university account and any of conditions (a)-(d) remains unsatisfied.
An executive officer reporting to the Dean is expected to gain prior approval whenever he or she is away for more than five full business days, regardless of the formal state of contract. The executive responsibility is deemed to cover the full year, unless formal arrangements for substitution have been made.

In the interest of consistency throughout the College, executive officers are encouraged to apply this same policy to all persons over whom they exercise authority (with only the change that prior approval is sought from the appropriate executive officer, not the Dean). If the executive officer deems that circumstances in the unit justify stricter rules, they may be applied.

Any travel policy in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences must require that approval and reimbursement be contingent on the making of responsible arrangements for coverage of the traveller’s local duties while he or she is absent. Classes may not be missed to allow for travel without compensatory arrangements. It is acceptable to provide for qualified substitute instructors, to schedule proctored hour examinations, to reschedule the class for another time announced well in advance, or to arrange for some other compensatory educational experience. Rescheduling of classes or the substitution of a compensatory experience should be done only with prior approval of the appropriate executive officer.
RECOMMENDED GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENT AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY MEMBERS WITH BUDGETED JOINT APPOINTMENTS IN TWO OR MORE UNITS

(Revised and Approved by the LAS Executive Committee, January 18, 1994)

**Purpose.** These recommendations are intended to provide guidance to LAS units for the appointment and review of faculty members with joint appointments. They are based on principles of mutual cooperation, open sharing of views, and fairness to the faculty member. While some procedures are left to the choice of the units, the goal of this document is to ensure that all relevant views are expressed at times of appointment and review, that effective communication is promoted between units or with the faculty member, and in general that a clear and orderly process is used for decisions affecting faculty members with joint appointments.

A. Initial Appointment

1. For a tenure-track position budgeted in two or more units the primary appointment should be in a unit that has departmental status, or de facto departmental status. Joint appointments between units neither of which enjoys such status are discouraged.

2. To secure the initial appointment the executive officers of the units involved must execute a joint letter to the Dean requesting the appointment. That letter must describe the terms of the appointment and the individual's responsibilities in each unit (i.e., instructional load, advising, committee service, etc.). The Dean will describe these terms of appointment and the responsibilities to each unit in the letter of offer to the candidate.

3. In the joint letter to the Dean requesting that an appointment be made, the unit heads must designate the home unit.” The designated home unit must have tenure-granting power and normally will be the unit with the largest percentage of the individual's appointment, or that represents the individual's primary discipline. The designated home unit will initiate the third-year review and the subsequent promotion and tenure reviews.

B. Third-Year Review

The designated home unit will initiate the third-year review. The review will involve the participation of both units and will represent the views of both. Either of the following procedures may be used.

1. Each unit may conduct its own review. The two units will share with each other the results of the two reviews and will confer about the report(s) to be issued. The units may send either separate reports or a joint report signed by both executive officers.

2. The two units may conduct a joint review, with a committee including members from both units. The findings of the joint committee will be sent to both units for evaluation, and the two units will confer about the kind of report(s) to be issued. Depending on the final evaluations of the individual units, they may then prepare and send to the faculty member either a single joint report signed by both executive officers, or separate reports from each executive officer reflecting the distinctive views of each unit.
When separate reports are issued, they will be copied to the other appointing unit. When joint reports are issued, observations and recommendations that are relevant to one unit and not the other, or differences in assessment between units, should be articulated carefully so that the faculty member is informed of commonly held opinions and of any views that are important to each of the units separately.

C. Promotion and Tenure Decisions

The recommended guidelines for promotion and tenure review procedures parallel those of the third-year review. The designated home unit has the primary responsibility for initiating and overseeing the review process, but the review should involve the participation and represent the views of both units. In developing their assessment, units must cooperate in securing external evaluations. Internally they may use their own customary procedures for promotion reviews, or the two units may construct an ad hoc joint review procedure. For example, either of the following procedures may be used.

1. Each unit may conduct its own review, the results of which will be shared with the jointly appointing unit.

2. The two units may conduct a joint review with a committee including members from both units, whose findings will be sent to both units.

Both units will then make their recommendations to the Dean, jointly if they are in agreement and separately if they are not. If there is a recommendation for promotion, or for promotion and tenure, the designated home department will have the primary responsibility for preparing the case. A joint recommendation to the Dean will be signed by both executive officers.
GUIDELINES FOR MENTORING AND REVIEWS OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD FACULTY IN THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES

(Endorsed by the Executive Committee)
(Approved by the Dean February 1999)

Overview

These guidelines set out expectations for departments’ active involvement with junior faculty during the probationary period. They call on development of procedures and practices fitting the discipline and department culture through which junior faculty will be made aware of departmental, college and campus promotion and tenure requirements and their responsibilities during the probationary period. The guidelines ask departments to do this within an approach that supports faculty development. We set very high standards for promotion and tenure, and those standards need to be understood by untenured faculty, but equally important, we want junior faculty to understand that we share their desires to build highly successful careers here. Rigorous evaluation is wholly compatible with active engagement and faculty development. Junior faculty deserve not only to clearly understand our expectations, but also to be made aware of sources of support available within the department and campus and to receive feedback from knowledgeable senior colleagues that is well-grounded, timely and helpful. Special emphasis is given in these guidelines to the third-year review, and they encompass and amplify on guidance in the Provost’s Communication No. 13, “Review of Faculty in Year Three of the Probationary Period”. These guidelines have grown out of annual oversight discussions of the third-year review letters by the LAS College Executive Committee and have been reviewed and approved by the Executive Committee.

A. Specific LAS College Guidelines for Third-Year Evaluation Letters of Probationary Faculty

1. The letter should be addressed to the faculty member from the unit executive officer and copied to the dean. That copy is due no later than April 1.

2. The letter should clearly specify the mechanics of the review process. For candidates with split appointments, this should include a summary of the process of consultation between units (see attached LAS and campus policies on coordination in joint appointments).

3. The letter should make clear that this is a mid-course evaluation to provide guidance for the probationary faculty member’s continuing development and cannot guarantee the outcome of the final review for promotion and tenure. Specific assurances regarding support for promotion and tenure should be avoided.

4. The letter should be based on a review using criteria that will be applied in the final tenure review. These criteria are set forth most clearly in the Provost’s Communication No. 9, “Promotion and Tenure.” LAS College reviews for tenure emphasize assessments of the documented quality of teaching and the potential to become a leading scholar in one’s field as demonstrated through peer evaluations of research achievements and publications.

5. The letter should critically assess research, including thoughtfully evaluating the major scholarly products of the faculty member’s research, the record of teaching and any areas for improvement, and assessment of the faculty member’s service and development as a campus citizen. The letter should specifically address the quality and projected impact of the candidate’s research. In addition to commenting on areas of strength, focused discussion should be given to those areas needing attention. The letter should explain clearly and directly the expectations that are held for promotion.
and tenure and where scholarly emphasis should be placed in the years immediately ahead.

Because the commentary will be substantive, it will necessarily be based on systematic assessments by colleagues who are knowledgeable about the candidate’s area of scholarship and on multiple forms of evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching.

The review should reflect the results of ongoing engagement with the probationary faculty member, rather than a first-time assessment.

Where a committee report has been prepared as the core of the evaluation, the letter from the executive officer should provide a synthesis of key points and specific advice.

6. The copy of the letter forwarded to the Dean should include as attachments (a) an ICES printout of all courses/instructor evaluations to date as required for promotion and tenure papers, and (b) a summary developed by the faculty member of the factual record of research/publication, teaching, and service following the guidelines for preparation of promotion dossiers.

7. Third-year evaluations are reviewed by the Executive Committee which functions as the College’s promotion and tenure committee.

B. Background and Amplification

1. Departmental Responsibilities: Active Engagement and Systematic Feedback

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences sets as a general expectation that all units housing tenure-track faculty will actively engage untenured faculty and initiate systematic and thoughtful discussion concerning expectations for promotion and tenure and provide accurate feedback regarding progress in meeting those expectations.

a. Each LAS unit should discuss and clarify its expectations for promotion and tenure and should develop clear guidelines for discipline-based achievements in research, teaching and service that realize the guidelines set forth in Provost’s Communication No. 9, “Promotion and Tenure.” These Campus guidelines state that a recommendation for indefinite tenure ultimately must be based upon a) an assessment that a candidate has made contributions of an appropriate magnitude and quality in research, teaching, and service, b) has demonstrated a high likelihood of sustaining contributions to the field and to the department, and c) that granting indefinite tenure will be in the best interest of the University of Illinois. LAS College reviews for tenure place emphasis on the realization of excellence in teaching and the high potential of the probationary faculty member to become a leading scholar in his or her field as demonstrated through research achievements and publications. Pretenure reviews and feedback should be made to help guide and support the career development of the untenured faculty member. All such reviews should be made with the ultimate criteria for promotion and tenure clearly in mind.

b. As stated in Provost’s Communication No. 13, “It is the responsibility of the department or equivalent academic unit to inform all faculty members of campus and college criteria for advancement in rank. If a unit has adopted additional criteria, these should also be communicated to faculty members. In addition to information about criteria for advancement, faculty members should receive information about the process used for promotion and tenure reviews, including
the separate reviews that take place at the department, college and campus levels.” Departments should take special care to provide the above information to untenured faculty within their first semester on campus. The College further asks that a procedure be developed for assuring that the expectations for promotion and tenure and the processes and timing for reviews are not merely distributed, but thoroughly discussed with new faculty.

c. Each unit should have specific written procedures approved by the appropriate faculty group for conducting the review of untenured faculty in the third year of their probationary period. Units are also encouraged to develop policies for providing written feedback at other points across the probationary period. As noted below, annual written feedback is encouraged. Unit procedures should provide for coordination and collaboration between units in producing evaluations for untenured faculty with joint appointments. (Please see the LAS policy statement: *Recommended Guidelines for Appointment and Review Procedures for Faculty Members with Budgeted Joint Appointments in Two or More Units.*)

Mechanisms that provide integrated, rather than separate, reports of assessment and expectation are encouraged.

d. Each unit should also develop a set of practices that fit the discipline and the unit’s culture that effectively engages and provides regular feedback and advice to each untenured faculty to support his or her development as a scholar, teacher and university citizen. It is important that the unit recognize its responsibility to be proactive in engaging and giving feedback to untenured faculty. This may take any form that is appropriate to the traditions and organization of the unit, including regular discussions between the unit executive officer and the faculty member, a program of mentoring that systematically connects the untenured faculty member with a specific senior faculty member, less formal mentoring approaches through which junior faculty are engaged with senior faculty, and the like. The development of appropriate mechanisms are strongly encouraged for cultivating the candidate’s development in each of the areas of performance on which tenure is granted (scholarship, teaching, and service).

e. It also is important that the department establish practices that make junior faculty aware both that it is the faculty member’s responsibility to develop successful programs of research, teaching and service and that the University seeks to facilitate the faculty’s success in these endeavors through providing a rich array of support for research, teaching improvement, outreach activities and personal development. Probationary faculty should be made aware of specific available support that may be relevant to their needs in research, teaching or service.

f. The College encourages development of approaches that give timely and regular feedback on performance through both informal and formal channels. An annual letter providing feedback to untenured faculty is encouraged. Such letters should be retained in departmental files and should not be forwarded to the College, except as is required for the Campus-mandated third year review.

2. General Considerations of Importance in Third-Year Evaluations and Other Evaluations During the Probationary Period

a. All guidance and evaluations provided untenured faculty during the probationary period should reflect development of materials as a basis for evaluation and the application of criteria in line with those used in the final promotion-and-tenure review. Thus it is advisable that the faculty member develop and annually add to a summary of the [actual record] of research/publication, teaching, and service
following the guidelines for preparation of promotion dossiers (this effectively translates the CV into a common format familiar to reviewing bodies). This factual record provides a sound beginning point for systematic assessment and focuses both the probationary faculty member and reviewers on the record of accomplishment directly relevant to promotion and tenure.

Communication No.13 makes clear that third-year reviews, and by implication other reviews during the probationary period, should be carried out systematically with attention to each aspect of the individual's performance on which the final tenure decision will be based. Pre-tenure evaluations should consistently apply the criteria that will be used in the final tenure-and-promotion review and should establish appropriate continuity across year-to-year reviews.

b. Feedback during the probationary period should involve both oral discussions and formal written letters, including the required third-year letter. Communication No.13 emphasizes the importance in identifying both strengths and weaknesses in evaluation processes. In specific reference to the third-year review, Communication No. 13 stresses that “fairness to the candidate requires that the review be as candid as possible about shortcomings so the candidate has an opportunity to correct his or her course before an ultimate recommendation must be made. Strengths similarly should be stated. Expectations for the coming years should be clearly laid out in the written evaluation report.”

c. All tenured faculty in a unit share in the responsibility of facilitating the development of its probationary faculty. However, to assure effective communication, it is wise to designate a single individual (most often the unit executive officer) to transmit formal feedback so the principal points of evaluation are stated unambiguously and clear guidance is provided to the probationary faculty member. If an evaluation involves a committee report, the executive officer's or Committee Chair's letter transmitting it should identify the central points of evaluation and advice.

d. Evaluations and feedback across the probationary period should critically assess research, including thoughtfully evaluating the major scholarly products of the faculty member's research. To the degree possible, this assessment should be carried out with rigor similar to that applied in evaluating the work as will be done at the point a decision on the final tenure recommendation is made. The advantage of pre-tenure assessments are that they provide opportunities to explain clearly and directly the expectations that are held for promotion and tenure and what work will need to be accomplished in the years before the final tenure review. Clear guidance should be given for where scholarly effort can best be focused. In most cases the assessment of the research and writing will be made by senior departmental colleagues in the area of the untenured faculty member. However, at the discretion of the unit the advice may be sought of evaluators from outside the campus.

e. Evaluations and feedback across the probationary period also should critically assess teaching and comment on how teaching can be improved. Probationary faculty will be well advised to develop portfolios documenting their teaching records, and departments are encouraged to make assessments of teaching using multiple modes of evaluation, including ICES ratings from students, interviews with graduate and undergraduate students, evaluation of syllabi and materials, multiple classroom observations over time and courses, candidate self-assessments, etc. Where teaching difficulties are identified, units should develop plans calculated to facilitate the candidate’s development as a teacher (actions might involve shifts in teaching assignments, a program of systematic classroom
observation and feedback, identification of colleagues whom the candidate should consult to discuss teaching performance, use of the support from the Office of Instructional Resources, etc.).

f. Assessments across the probationary period should include discuss of the probationary faculty member’s opportunities for contribution in service and for development as a citizen of the campus. It is the responsibility of every department to promote the development of attitudes of institutional responsibility and to provide mechanisms through which untenured faculty can develop as contributing members of the campus community. While it is important to make service assignments that appropriately engage untenured faculty in the affairs of the unit, such assignments should be appropriate in the context of overall responsibilities so that development in teaching and research are not placed at jeopardy.