

A Faculty Guide for Relating Continuing
Education and Public Service to the Promotion
and Tenure Review Process

ABSTRACT

This guide is intended to assist UIUC faculty members to plan and evaluate their continuing education and public service activities and to better relate these activities to the promotion and tenure review process. The information and suggestions presented in the guide are based upon two years of extensive data collection, analysis, and collaboration with campus faculty members and academic administrators.

The campus guidelines for promotion and tenure make it clear that:

Outstanding teaching and research by faculty members in continuing education and public service activities should be considered as equivalent to comparable performance in resident instruction and other research activities for purposes of promotion and tenure decisions. (1983-84 Academic Affairs Communication No. 10)

Discussions with promotion and tenure committee members at the departmental, college, and campus levels suggest that this comparability is most firmly established when the evidence used to demonstrate outstanding continuing education and public service efforts is understood and accepted by those involved in the promotion and tenure review process.

The guide suggests a process for planning and evaluating continuing education and public service activities with the promotion and tenure review process in mind. These suggestions grew out of discussions with faculty members involved in the promotion and tenure process, a survey of promotion and tenure committee members, and an extensive review of faculty promotion and tenure papers.

Four points emerged from this work and are examined in the guide.

1. Faculty outreach efforts are most highly valued when they help demonstrate that the faculty member is "at the leading edge" and making significant contributions to new knowledge in his or her discipline or profession. Promotion and tenure committee members suggest that continuing education and public service efforts contribute most to scholarly stature when they are: reported or cited in scholarly publications, shown to impact upon public policy, or demonstrate innovative breakthroughs in linking theory with practice.

2. Senior faculty members from other comparable institutions represent a valuable source of evidence regarding the excellence of a faculty member's continuing education and public service efforts. In particular, they can comment on the extent to which these activities have made a substantial contribution to the discipline or profession and the extent to which they have been recognized by other scholars, public policy makers, or practitioners.
3. If faculty continuing education and public service activities are to be used to help justify a favorable promotion or tenure decision, they should be planned with that use in mind. Faculty members should plan their efforts far in advance and design them for qualitative evaluation. Department chairs or heads should be involved in the planning process in order to insure that the faculty member's proposed continuing education and public service activities are consistent with departmental expectations. Departmental executive committee members, senior faculty members, and promotion and tenure committee members should also be asked to share their insights regarding the campus promotion and tenure process.
4. When preparing promotion and tenure papers, it is important to emphasize those continuing education and public service efforts which are truly innovative, creative, and supportive of the faculty member's scholarly stature. These efforts should be carefully and completely described with particular attention to the evaluation criteria and results. Where the normal criteria for judging scholarly excellence are not appropriate for judging a particular outreach activity, alternative criteria should be clearly described and justified.

This guide emphasizes the importance of planning early, understanding departmental expectations, designing activities with evaluation in mind, and being sure that any evaluation is consistent with the demands of the promotion and tenure review process. Far too often, innovative and scholarly faculty continuing education and public service activities fail to receive appropriate recognition because the faculty member did not pay proper attention to one or more of these considerations.

training and supervising teaching assistants, through extensive independent study or informal interactions with students, through involvement with graduate students, etc.

- h. Student learning. Provision of measures of student learning is encouraged. These might include exceptional awards or recognition earned by students, evidence of student success in later coursework in a sequence, evaluation of student work products such as exams, papers, artwork, or performances, and so on.

2. Continuing Education

Evaluate continuing education activities. (See 1977-78 Academic Affairs Communication No. 56, "A Statement on the Evaluation of Outreach Teaching and Scholarship." Attachment II of this document is an abstract of the report. The full report is available from the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.)

B. Research, Creative, and Other Scholarly Activities

Research should be evaluated (not merely described) on the dimensions of quality, significance of topic, impact on the field, etc.

- 1. Evaluate one or two most significant publications
- 2. Evaluate research accomplishments and future potential

C. Service (Public and University)

1. Professional and Public Service

Evaluate public and professional services performed

2. Administrative Services to the University

Evaluate service on departmental, college, and University committees and special administrative assignments or tasks

D. Other Services

Evaluate services as indicated in IV., D., above

- VI. The candidate must provide in 4 pages or less a statement of research accomplishments (since the last promotion at UIUC if being recommended for promotion to professor). As well as

describing the accomplishments, the statement should tie together past research and how it relates to future research plans and to teaching/service duties.

If teaching or service is the primary criterion, the statement must reflect those accomplishments and future plans and how they relate to research.

- VII. List the names, addresses, and affiliations of five scholars or professional specialists outside the University of Illinois who can be expected to be familiar with the work of the nominee. Also, give a description of the qualifications of each evaluator. Secure letters from at least three of them to support the case for promotion. 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. Letters from colleagues/collaborators, former professors, mentors, and by persons of a lower rank than the recommended rank of the candidate are discouraged since they may be discounted at the Campus level. Include a copy of the letter or letters used to solicit these outside evaluations. The letters must be preceded by one page on which the qualifications of the evaluator are listed. In order to identify those referees chosen by the candidate from those chosen by the department, you must type after the referee's name in parentheses (chosen by the candidate) or (chosen by the department). If a letter of evaluation is not solicited from someone who is listed, please indicate that by typing after the referee's name in parentheses (letter not requested). Also, include a statement explaining why an evaluator did not respond.

- VIII. Special comments by unit executive officer.

(It would be appropriate to indicate any outstanding characteristics of the staff member not covered in the preceding sections. The department head should include in his/her comments the additional evidence that has led to the resubmission of a promotion recommendation from the previous year. Also, the department head is strongly encouraged to address any negative aspects of the candidate's record or the outside letters and explain why these aspects should not be decisive in the case in question.)

Office of the Vice Chancellor
for Academic Affairs
Urbana-Champaign Campus
August, 1992

- c. Student ICES course evaluation questionnaires. These must be provided for every semester and every course under review. The ICES data must be presented in summary form and departmental norms given where possible. Raw data are not acceptable. A summary table is generally the most efficient way to present the ICES data.
- d. Course document review. Instructional materials such as syllabi, bibliographies, textbooks, test questions, grading policies and procedures must be evaluated by colleagues.

Additional documentation suggested, not required:

- e. Information from students, alumni, and others. Surveys or interviews with seniors, alumni, and others can provide a perspective different from that of students currently enrolled, and this can be a valuable source of information. This might be done systematically for entire curricula, with individual items for individual courses and instructors.
- f. Classroom observation by colleagues. This method is valuable for it requires considerable communication among faculty being evaluated and their colleagues involved in evaluation, but it requires more than one visit by more than one faculty observer. Departments are encouraged to employ this method of evaluation whenever feasible.
- g. Other contributions to instructional programs. Some faculty make significant contributions to instructional programs of other sorts, e.g., through development of course materials used by other instructors, through EXCEL projects, through training and supervising teaching assistants, through extensive independent study or informal interactions with students, through involvement with graduate students, etc.
- h. Student learning. Provision of measures of student learning is encouraged. These might include exceptional awards or recognition earned by students, evidence of student success in later coursework in a sequence, evaluation of student work products such as exams, papers, artwork, or performances, and so on.

2. Continuing Education

Evaluate continuing education activities. (See 1977-78 Academic Affairs Communication No. 56, "A Statement on the Evaluation of Outreach Teaching and Scholarship." Attachment II of this document is an abstract of the report. The full report is available from the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.)

B. Research, Creative, and Other Scholarly Activities

Research should be evaluated (not merely described) on the dimensions of quality, significance of topic, impact on the field, etc.

1. Evaluate one or two most significant publications
2. Evaluate research accomplishments and future potential

C. Service (Public and University)

1. Professional and Public Service

Evaluate public and professional services performed

2. Administrative Services to the University

Evaluate service on departmental, college, and University committees and special administrative assignments or tasks

D. Other Services

Evaluate services as indicated in III., D., above

- V. The candidate must provide in 4 pages or less a statement of research accomplishments (since the last promotion at UIUC if being recommended for promotion to professor). As well as describing the accomplishments, the statement should tie together past research and how it relates to future research plans and to teaching/service duties.

If teaching or service is the primary criterion, the statement must reflect those accomplishments and future plans and how they relate to research.

- VI. List the names, addresses, and affiliations of five scholars or professional specialists outside the University of Illinois who can be expected to be familiar with the work of the nominee. Also, give a description of the qualifications of each evaluator. Secure letters from at least three of them to support the case for promotion. 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. Letters from colleagues/collaborators, former professors, mentors, and by persons of a lower rank than the recommended rank of the candidate are discouraged since they may be discounted at the Campus level. Include a copy of the letter or letters used to solicit these outside evaluations. The letters must be preceded by one page on which the qualifications of the evaluator are listed. In order to identify those referees chosen by the candidate from those chosen by the department, you must type after the referee's name in parentheses (chosen by the candidate) or (chosen by the department). If a letter of evaluation is not solicited from someone who

is listed, please indicate that by typing after the referee's name in parentheses (letter not requested). Also, include a statement explaining why an evaluator did not respond.

VII. Special comments by unit executive officer.

(It would be appropriate to indicate any outstanding characteristics of the staff member not covered in the preceding sections. The department head should include in his/her comments the additional evidence that has led to the resubmission of a promotion recommendation from the previous year. Also, the department head is strongly encouraged to address any negative aspects of the candidate's record or the outside letters and explain why these aspects should not be decisive in the case in question.)

Office of the Vice Chancellor
for Academic Affairs
Urbana-Champaign Campus
August, 1991