

Appointments, Reappointments, Promotions, and Tenure Process Guidelines¹

1. In the BSD, the definitive statement of criteria is "Pathways for successful faculty development and promotion" (May 2011), <http://tiny.cc/BSDPathways>.

2. Each department should distribute to its faculty, both annually to all faculty, and again to all faculty who are candidates for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, its policy regarding which BSD faculty tracks and ranks may attend faculty meetings and vote on departmental recommendations in addition to any departmental processes to be followed, e.g., whether a research seminar or an ad hoc committee is required in particular cases. Departments have reasonable discretion in setting these policies, excepting that in tenure recommendations the votes of the tenured faculty must be reported separately from those of other eligible voters. If a department needs to make an exception to its policies and/or these guidelines, it should first notify the Office of Academic Affairs², which will seek advice as to whether the intended exception poses any issues. Additionally, appointive actions should be guided by the following resolution endorsed by the department chairs of the BSD in summer 2013:

The Shils Report states: "All academic appointments to University faculties must be treated with great seriousness. They should, wherever it is at all possible, be made on the basis of careful study by members of the appointive body... All appointments...must be conducted with the same thorough deliberation, the same careful study of relevant documentation and other evidence, and the same process of consultation." The BSD concurs with this statement. In the BSD, the deliberations preceding votes on appointments, reappointments, promotions, or tenure should be among the most robust and open discussions that the faculty have.

Chairs and Section Chiefs can facilitate our objectives by:

- (a) Making all relevant documentation and evidence available to the faculty eligible to vote
- (b) Providing ample notice of discussions so that faculty can arrange their schedules to participate or provide written/electronic assessments for consideration in the discussion
- (c) Providing sufficient time for a complete discussion
- (d) Ensuring that all candidates receive full discussion whether the expected outcome is positive or negative

In turn, frank and robust discussions rely upon the faculty's observance of strict confidentiality. Nonetheless, candidates for appointive actions should be fully apprised well in advance of relevant deadlines for submission of materials and decision announcements, the process of decision-making, and the criteria to be applied. When any exceptions to these guidelines are necessary, they should be disclosed in advance to the BSD Office of Academic Affairs², which will arrange for their review, or to the Dean.

3. The primary responsibility for applying the criteria and evaluating a candidate's performance in relation to them lies with the departmental faculty eligible to vote.

¹ This document is designed to aid in outlining processes that will avoid un-necessary complications with faculty appointments in the BSD. Our intention is to provide guidelines, meaning that significant room is left for reasonable expert judgment. Departures from these guidelines should be communicated in advance to the Office of Academic Affairs, which will arrange for their review.

² The Office of Academic Affairs will act as a clearinghouse to route communications to their proper recipient.

4. Cases for associate professor, professor, and tenure must include assessments by external consultants. Distinguished faculty who have no collaborative, collegial, or training relationship with the candidate and who are in peer programs at peer institutions will normally require no justification as credible external consultants, and some should normally be represented in any set of letters obtained. External consultants other than these are welcome, but their inclusion should be explained in the Chair's Letter.

5. In soliciting letters as in #4, the faculty eligible to vote (or their delegates) should consider carefully the most appropriate external consultants, and aim for no more than the 7 who can best evaluate the candidate. Those selected should be provided with the same data (except when confidential) used by the department to arrive at its own assessment. Exceptions to this numerical limit should be justified in the Chair's Letter. Candidates' suggestions of consultants should be no more than 30% of the total number.

6. Especially in matters invisible to the outside, e.g., teaching, many clinical procedures such as anesthesia, diagnostic radiology, primary care, and administration, dispassionate assessments of clinical and educational acumen from BSD faculty in the same or other departments may be solicited and will be given considerable weight. These may be shared with external consultants, redacted as necessary.

7. The departmental recommendation, the Divisional committee's advice, and the Dean's recommendation must not be disclosed until the Provost's decision is announced. Any need for earlier disclosure to the candidate should be discussed in advance with the Office of Academic Affairs², which will seek approval for the proposed disclosure. Proposed new appointees, who may not understand our system, should be explicitly counseled to avoid premature disclosures based on a Contingent Letter of Offer.

8. Tenure proposals on behalf of non-BSD track faculty are December 15th decisions.

9. When a department recommends that a non-tenured faculty member's employment end, the department must immediately notify the Office of Academic Affairs², which will have the process of decision-making reviewed and seek authorization to disclose the decision to the candidate. The notification should briefly explain the rationale for the decision was reached, the process of decision-making, and who was consulted in making it. [There is no necessity for the Chair to consult all departmental faculty in sensitive cases.] The Office of Academic Affairs² will also remind the department (as it also will if the Provost denies a positive departmental recommendation):

- (a) To disclose the decision to the candidate as soon as permission to do so is received.
- (b) To assist the candidate in transitioning to another position, to communicate counseling/career resources, and offer appropriate counsel.
- (c) To discuss transition plans for funding, mentorship of trainees, educational and committee obligations, etc.
- (d) To review end-of-appointment expectations (see #12).

10. Departments must inform all untenured faculty track in writing (cc: to the Office of Academic Affairs) at least two months in advance as to when materials in support of reappointment, promotion, or tenure are due. Except as described in 10a and 10b, the department must either undertake the normal assessment or inform the Office of Academic Affairs that no materials have been submitted by the deadline. The faculty member may submit supplementary materials and information after the deadline, but their inclusion in decision-making is not guaranteed.

a. If an untenured faculty member wishes to avoid the normal assessment, the faculty member must provide a commitment in writing that they will disaffiliate from the faculty at the end of the appointment (Appendix). The department must then transmit this notification to the Office of Academic Affairs and then cease or not begin its assessment. If the notification reaches the department after the date materials are due, the department must also transmit to the Office of Academic Affairs copies of all materials obtained, a summary of all departmental assessments conducted (including that by committees, sections, and leadership), and any votes taken; further assessment and voting should not be conducted.

b. Before materials are due, a department may also decide to suggest that an untenured faculty member commit to disaffiliate from the faculty as described in #10a. This suggestion must be reviewed as described in #9 before transmittal to the faculty member. The faculty member must be informed that the suggestion may be declined, in which case the normal assessment must ensue.

11. If the judgment of the faculty eligible to vote, Divisional review committees, deans, and provosts is appealed to the provost, the provost will limit review to the integrity of the process and will not interfere with the academic judgment made by the department regarding the merits of the case.

12. Disaffiliation from the University is normal when a faculty appointment lapses without additional appointment.

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

1. When a faculty member is appointed in more than one department, normally one is primary and the others are secondary. The primary department assesses overall academic performance and recommends an action to the Dean and Provost. Secondary BSD departments assess the contribution to the secondary departments and vote on this basis to concur with the recommendation of the primary department; if this does not occur, there is no secondary appointment. Concurrence is also required when the secondary appointment is in a non-BSD department, School, Institute for Molecular Engineering, or in an interdivisional institute. Be advised that the processes, practices, and timelines outside the BSD may be different from those within the BSD, and the implications of such diversity should be understood fully in advance.

2. The Cancer Center and any secondary unit providing resources essential to the proposed appointment should also concur. Ph.D.-granting Committees need not concur in cases involving an existing member,

although they may do so. New secondary appointments to Ph.D.-granting Committees require a faculty vote.

3. Actions involving basic science departments almost always require the concurrence of The College, as do any clinical department actions involving a College appointment:

(a) New faculty searches: department chair or chair's designate must consult with the BSCD Master's Office after a faculty vote to recommend an offer, and in advance of a second visit if there is one. This allows the BSCD Master to discuss College teaching obligations with the chair, the candidate, or both before a CLO is drafted.

(b) Contingent Letters of Offer (CLOs): provide the text of the draft 'Education/Teaching' section to the BSCD Master's Office.

(c) Recommendations to the BSD Dean and Provost for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure:

i. Notify the BSCD Master's Office one month in advance of the faculty discussion/vote on reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure to allow the Master's assessment to be prepared and considered by the voting faculty

ii. Transmit the BSCD Routing form (<http://tiny.cc/CollegeForm>) and accompanying documentation as described at its bottom to the BSCD Master's Office.

Communications should be transmitted c/o Ms. Kila Roberts, BSCD Administrator, kila@uchicago.edu, (773) 702-7962, BSLC 328

4. Cases for new appointments of Instructors and Assistant Professors require 3 letters of assessment. Cases for promotion to Assistant Professor also requires 3 letters of assessment unless those solicited for the initial appointment speak to suitability for the rank of Assistant Professor. These letters may be from current or former supervisors. All other cases are subject to review by the appropriate Divisional standing committee, COROAP or COAP.

5. The following normally apply. Exceptions should be discussed with the Office of Academic Affairs³ as soon as the need for an exception is known or anticipated.

(a) Complete (except for the occasional late-arriving letter) COAP cases must be submitted electronically to the Office of Academic Affairs by noon three weeks before the scheduled COAP meeting.

(b) COAP normally meets 1-2X per month except late July-early August. With the exception of December 15th cases, COAP slots should be reserved as soon as their expected readiness dates are known by transmitting the expected readiness date to the Faculty Dean. All else equal, slots are first come, first served. To book a COAP slot, follow the instructions at <http://tiny.cc/coapdates>

(c) COAP reviews December 15th cases in late September and October, and scheduling flexibility is limited. This will, in some cases, require departments to anticipate faculty vacation schedules and plan accordingly.

(d) The COROAP schedule:

	Cases due in the Office of Academic Affairs	COROAP meets	Target date for decision announcement
BSD track appointments beginning July-December	Late August	September-October	December 15th
BSD track appointments beginning January-June	March 1	Early Spring Quarter	June 15th
~4-year SOM track appointments ending 30 June	March 1	Early Spring Quarter	Before start of final year, e.g., last week of June
Other SOM track appointments	As arranged		

(e) Instructions for preparation of cases may be downloaded: http://tiny.cc/compendium_docx

(f) A department that contemplates an early recommendation for promotion to associate professor in the BSD track or promotion to associate professor BSD without tenure should immediately contact the Office of Academic Affairs³, which will arrange for appropriate discussion.

(g) Allow 4-5 weeks after the COAP date for a final decision, which may come sooner or later depending on the availabilities of reviewers at higher levels.

(h) Proposals for promotion to Professor in the BSD track should have an effective date of the next 1 July, although they should be submitted and approved at any time of year.

(i) For 5-year term associate and full professorships in the SOM and CS tracks, reappointment proposals are due in the Office of Academic Affairs no later than 14 months before the end of the term, with the target date for decision announcement before the start of the final year of the term.

APPENDIX: REQUEST BY NON-TENURED FACULTY TO FOREGO THE NORMAL DEPARTMENTAL ASSESSMENT

[The top portion should be completed by the faculty member and a hard copy transmitted to the department chair, who should sign the bottom portion and transmit it to the BSD Office of Academic Affairs, which will note the decision and provide a copy of the completed form to the faculty member, Dean, and Provost.]

Dear _____,
[Department Chair]

As a faculty member without tenure in the Department of _____,
I wish not to be considered for reappointment or promotion when my current appointment ends. I understand that when my appointment ends on _____, I will not be employed by or otherwise affiliated with the University of Chicago.

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Date: _____

Dear _____,
[Faculty Member]

I acknowledge your decision and confirm that your appointment will end on _____.
On behalf of the Department of _____, I want to thank you for your contributions during your time here and wish you all the best in the future.

Signature: _____
[Department Chair]

Date: _____

Noted on behalf of the Biological Sciences Division: _____

Date: _____

Cc: Dean of the Biological Sciences Division
Office of the Provost