

[Click here to see this online](#)



Dear Colleagues,

We would like to call to your attention the following three changes relating to faculty appointments and promotion and tenure dossiers and procedures.

### **1. INCLUSION OF A STATEMENT OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND INCLUSION IN P&T DOSSIERS.**

Beginning with faculty hired this year, a statement of diversity, equity, and inclusion will be required as part of the P&T dossier for all faculty tracks and ranks. This statement provides candidates with the opportunity to demonstrate the activities they have undertaken to contribute to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Department and College P&T norms and criteria must be modified to reflect the value placed on efforts directed towards diversity, equity, and inclusion, and the Offices of Diversity and Faculty Affairs will provide additional resources to guide the writing and the evaluation of these statements. [Departmental and college norms must be changed before the beginning of Fall 2021 semester.](#)

A sample form and guidelines for the preparation of a diversity, equity, and inclusion statement may be found [here](#) at the end of the summary document of P&T modifications.

**NOTE:** The Diversity statement will be required for all new faculty; it is optional for faculty who received their first Notice of Appointment (NOA) prior to Aug. 1, 2021.

### **2. CHANGES TO P&T VOTING RIGHTS AND OTHER GUIDELINES.**

Currently, half of existing departments extend voting rights to all rank eligible faculty for promotion and tenure decisions, and approximately half use subcommittees of eligible faculty. For those departments that use subcommittees, several departments use elected faculty members while some are appointed by the Head/Chair of the department.

Because appointed committees raise the potential for bias, and because decisions about promotion and tenure are possibly the most important decisions that departments make, we are making two important changes to these rules.

1. For departments with 50 or fewer eligible faculty members, a P & T committee must be established consisting of all eligible faculty (at least 3 members). For committees larger than 3 members, a seventy-five percent quorum is required to review and vote on promotion and tenure cases. In small units (those with fewer than three eligible voters) the Dean shall establish a P & T committee that includes faculty from other departmental or campus (UIC) units who are qualified by expertise and who meet all other eligibility standards.
2. For departments with more than 50 eligible faculty members, faculty-elected subcommittees consisting of at least 75% of eligible faculty members or 35 eligible members, whichever is less, will review and vote on P & T cases. Any process variation other than a faculty-elected subcommittee must be approved by the Provost.

A summary of all of the approved P&T modifications can be found [here](#).

### **3. ADOPTION OF THE TEACHING MODIFIER FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY APPOINTMENTS.**

On November 12, 2020, the Board of Trustees approved amending the University of Illinois Statutes ([Article IX, Section 3c](#)) to include the use of “Teaching” as a modifier for non-tenure track faculty ranks (Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, Teaching Professor). Departments with NTT faculty whose primary function is teaching now have available the use of this modifier in place of the previously used “Clinical” modifier. The addition of the Teaching modifier will require modification of Department and College P&T norms and criteria as well as other policies and guidelines. Additional guidance for the use of this modifier will be provided by March 1, 2021. [Department and college norms for the inclusion of the Teaching modifier must be changed before the beginning of the Fall 2021 semester and decisions for changes in faculty titles must be made by June 1, 2022.](#)

Sincerely,

Nancy E. Freitag  
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

## Summary of Modifications to P & T Guidelines

*(based on feedback from 2018 and 2020 task force meetings and Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Passed by Faculty Senate January 28, 2021)*

*The text of the revised or new guidelines follows the summary below with changes indicated in red.*

### Overview of Modifications

#### 1. Collaborator Attestations.

**Adopted Change:** Attestations from collaborators/co-authors for tenure track faculty remain required for the paper preparer to solicit to ascertain the candidate's significant contributions associated with a substantial collaboration with a senior scholar or investigator. Language is now added to clarify what constitutes a substantial collaboration. For non-tenure track faculty or those seeking promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, a UEO is now given the option to solicit an attestation to explain the role of a candidate in collaborative work involving a large number of collaborators on a single, important project, as is common in a team science model.

#### 2. Dual relationships for UEOs and paper preparers.

**Adopted Change:** Minor modifications to more explicitly exclude graduate student mentors and postdoctoral mentors or those with substantial collaborations (see above definition) from serving as paper preparers.

#### 3. Dual relationships and voting:

**Adopted Change:** Change to indicate that those with a substantial collaboration during the relevant review time period should recuse themselves from voting. Additional sentence added to account for team science: 'However, a faculty member may vote if their sole relationship with the candidate involves a large number of collaborators on a single, important project, as is common in a team science model.'

#### 4. Rank of solicited external referees and candidate suggestions for referees:

**Adopted Change:** Candidates are now allowed to suggest names, institutions, or departments from which external evaluators may be selected; final decision on the solicitation of external referees is made by the UEO. External referees may now be at or above the rank of promotion (for example, Associate Professors or above may write evaluations for candidates going from Assistant to Associate), however Full Professors are preferred when possible.

#### 5. Voting participation in departments:

**Adopted change:** Currently, half of existing departments extend voting rights to all rank eligible faculty for promotion and tenure decisions, and approximately half use subcommittees of eligible faculty. For those departments that use subcommittees, several departments use elected faculty members while some are appointed by the Head/Chair of the department. Because appointed committees raise the potential for bias, and because decisions about promotion and tenure are possibly the most important decisions that departments make, we are making two important changes to these rules.

- i. For departments with 50 or fewer eligible faculty members, a P & T committee must be established consisting of all eligible faculty (at least 3 members). For committees larger than 3 members, a seventy-five percent quorum is required to review and vote on promotion and tenure cases. In small units (those with fewer than three eligible voters) the Dean shall establish a P & T committee that includes faculty from other departmental or campus (UIC) units who are qualified by expertise and who meet all other eligibility standards.

- ii. For departments with more than 50 eligible faculty members, faculty-elected subcommittees consisting of at least 75% of eligible faculty members or 35 eligible members, whichever is less, will review and vote on P & T cases. Any process variation other than a faculty-elected subcommittee must be approved by the Provost.

**6. Inclusion of a statement of diversity, equity, and inclusion.** This issue was discussed in detail by the Faculty Equity Committee, and that committee's recommendation was that a statement of diversity, equity, and inclusion be mandatory for all tracks and all ranks. A mandatory statement best embodies the commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion as a core value of UIC. Additionally, the addition of a personal statement provides candidates with the opportunity to demonstrate the activities they have undertaken to contribute to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Many underrepresented faculty report being overtaxed by committee service and mentoring, thus this personal statement gives them the opportunity to demonstrate efforts being expended on behalf of the university. Knowledge that such a statement is required should incentivize all faculty to act in a way that supports diversity at the university. The goal is for faculty to demonstrate how they support diversity within their current responsibilities, not to add to the pre-existing requirements of teaching, research, and service.

Form and guidelines for the preparation of a diversity, equity, and inclusion statement may be found at the end of this document.

NOTE: The Diversity statement will be required for all new faculty; it is optional for faculty who received their first Notice of Appointment (NOA) prior to Aug. 1, 2021.

**7. Emphasis that Department Heads/Chairs cannot veto a faculty member's opportunity to apply for promotion from Associate to Full Professor.** This situation arises when a faculty member meets the norms and criteria for promotion but promotion is not supported by the Head/Chair. The decision of a faculty member to submit a dossier for promotion review is currently supported by the guidelines but may not be generally known or observed across all units. Additional text has therefore been added to emphasize that the choice to go up for promotion rests ultimately with the candidate.

#### **Adopted modifications (changes indicated in red).**

##### **1. Collaborator attestations.**

###### **Original text:**

*Policy Part 1, Section 3.F.5. Letters from Collaborators/Co-Authors. Unit executive officer(s) equivalent must solicit an attestation for candidates who have had a substantial collaboration with a senior scholar or investigator since the last personnel action period. This requirement applies only to tenure-system assistant professors and to associate professors seeking tenure (i.e. associate professors with Q-appointments only). It does not apply to non-tenure system faculty or those seeking promotion to full professor.*

###### **Adopted text:**

*Policy Part 1, Section 3.F.5. Attestations from Collaborators/Co-Authors. Unit executive officer(s) equivalent must solicit an attestation for candidates who have had a substantial collaboration with a senior scholar or investigator since the last personnel action period **in order to ascertain the candidate's independence or significant contribution(s).** This requirement applies only to tenure-system assistant professors and to associate professors seeking tenure (i.e. associate professors with Q-appointments only). ~~It does not apply to non-tenure system faculty or those seeking promotion to full professor.~~ **It is optional for non-tenure system faculty or those***

*seeking promotion to full professor to explain the role of a candidate in collaborative work involving a large number of collaborators on a single, important project, as is common in a team science model.*

*Substantial collaboration is defined as a high volume of any of the following activities during the relevant review period (such that the candidate's scholarly independence might be questioned): the collaborator(s) co-authored a significant portion of the candidate's articles or most significant articles(s); the collaborator(s) co-authored a book with the candidate; the collaborator served as a co-investigator on a major grant with the candidate; and/or there is on-going and substantial evidence of co-authorship or co-investigator status with the candidate's Ph.D. advisor or post-doctoral advisor.*

## **2. Dual relationships for UEOs and paper preparers:**

### **Original text:**

Policy Part 1, Section 3.D, p. 19. Responsibility for the case. *The unit executive officer takes responsibility for the preparation, accuracy, and confidentiality of the papers (i.e., serves in the role of paper preparer), unless the dean assigns someone else the responsibility. In such cases of reassignment, this individual is then referred to as the paper preparer designee. Under no circumstance should anyone serve as paper preparer if, for example, the candidate has a history of a substantial collaborative scholarly relationship with the unit executive officer, in cases where nepotism may be implicated, or in cases where other valid reasons exist. In these cases, the Dean should write a letter to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs indicating that a re-assignment is necessary, and briefly explaining the rationale for that reassignment (with supporting documentation). In order to serve as the paper preparer, the unit executive officer or designee must be eligible to vote for the candidate. If the unit executive officer does not meet this requirement, a faculty member who meets the eligibility requirements must be appointed by the Dean. In those situations, (when the unit executive officer is an associate professor and the candidate is being recommended for promotion to full professor), the statement of endorsement or non-endorsement must be prepared by the full professor who is charged with preparing the case. In other cases, where the Unit Executive Officer is eligible to vote without conflict but a separate paper preparer has been assigned for other reasons that are consistent with unit bylaws, the Unit Executive Officer remains responsible for preparing the statement of endorsement or non-endorsement and for signing that endorsement on the dossier cover sheet. By signing the cover sheet, the Unit Executive Officer or paper preparer designee assumes full responsibility for the accuracy and confidentiality of the contents of the dossier.*

### **Adopted text:**

Policy Part 1, 3.D. Responsibility for the Case. *The unit executive officer takes responsibility for the preparation, accuracy, and confidentiality of the papers (i.e., serves in the role of paper preparer), unless the dean/**unit executive officer or equivalent** assigns someone else the responsibility. In such cases of reassignment, this individual is then referred to as the 'paper preparer designee.' Under no circumstance should anyone serve as paper preparer if, ~~for example, the candidate has a history of a substantial collaborative scholarly relationship with the unit executive officer, in cases where nepotism may be implicated, or in cases where other valid reasons exist.~~ **they have a history of a substantial collaborative scholarly relationship with the candidate during the relevant review period, or in cases where the unit executive officer /paper preparer has served as the Ph.D. advisor or post-doc advisor; in cases where nepotism may be implicated; or in cases where other valid reasons exist such as other academic or financial conflicts.** In these cases, the Dean must write a letter to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs indicating that a re-assignment is necessary, and briefly explaining the rationale for that reassignment (with supporting documentation). In order to serve as the paper preparer, the unit executive officer or designee must be eligible to vote for the candidate. If the unit executive officer*



*does not meet this requirement, a faculty member who meets the eligibility requirements must be appointed by the Dean. In those situations, (when the unit executive officer is an associate professor and the candidate is being recommended for promotion to full professor), the statement of endorsement or non-endorsement must be prepared by the full professor who is charged with preparing the case. In other cases, where the Unit Executive Officer is eligible to vote without conflict but a separate paper preparer has been assigned for other reasons ~~that are consistent with unit bylaws~~, the Unit Executive Officer remains responsible for preparing the statement of endorsement or non-endorsement and for signing that endorsement on the dossier cover sheet. By signing the cover sheet, the Unit Executive Officer or paper preparer designee assumes full responsibility for the accuracy and confidentiality of the contents of the dossier.*

*(Units not organized as departments should follow the guidelines in Section 4: College Level Reviews).*

*The unit executive officer is responsible for reviewing and approving the external reviewer list, unless they have a conflict. In the case of a conflict, the person ultimately responsible for serving as the paper preparer shall also be responsible for approving the external reviewer list.*

### **3. Dual relationships and voting:**

#### **Original text:**

Policy Part 1, Section 2.F.3.b, p. 13. Dual Relationships and Voting. *UIC faculty members who are in a relationship characterized by substantial academic collaboration with a candidate under P&T review must recuse themselves from voting or otherwise endorsing or not endorsing the candidate for promotion and/or tenure at any level. For example, the term “substantial collaboration” between a candidate and another faculty member includes a high volume of any of the following activities (so much so as that the candidate’s independence is in question): the faculty member co-authored a paper with the candidate that is of particular import in the discipline; the faculty member co-authored a book with the candidate; the faculty member served as a co-investigator on a grant with the candidate; and/or the faculty member appeared as a co-author on many of the candidate’s peer-reviewed papers. These, and similar activities that demonstrate substantial collaboration disallow the faculty member from voting on the candidate’s case at any level. Additionally, if a UIC faculty member was the candidate’s primary PhD adviser or the candidate’s primary post-doc adviser, he or she should not vote on the case at any level. Instead, UIC faculty who are academic collaborators with a candidate are encouraged to submit letters of support as commentary regarding the independence of the candidate and/or quality of work.*

#### **Adopted text:**

Policy Part 1, Section 2.F.3.b. Internal Collaborations. *UIC faculty members who are in a relationship characterized by substantial academic collaboration with a candidate under P&T review **during the relevant review time period** must recuse themselves from voting or otherwise endorsing or not endorsing the candidate for promotion and/or tenure at any level. For example, the term “substantial collaboration” between a candidate and another faculty member includes a high volume of any of the following activities during the relevant review period (such that the candidate’s scholarly independence might be questioned): the faculty member co-authored a significant portion of the candidate’s articles or most significant article(s); the faculty member co-authored a book with the candidate; the faculty member served as a co-investigator on a major grant with the candidate; and/or there is ongoing and substantial evidence of co-authorship or co-investigator status with the candidate’s Ph.D. advisor or post-doctoral advisor. These, and similar activities that demonstrate substantial collaboration disallow the faculty member from voting on the candidate’s case at any level. Additionally, if a UIC faculty member was the candidate’s primary PhD adviser or the candidate’s primary*

post-doc adviser, he or she should not vote on the case at any level. Instead, UIC faculty who are academic collaborators with a candidate are encouraged to submit letters of support as commentary regarding the independence of the candidate and/or quality of work. **However, a faculty member may vote if their sole relationship with the candidate involves a large number of collaborators on a single, important project, as is common in a team science model.**

#### 4. Rank of solicited external referees and candidate suggestions for referees:

##### Original text:

Policy Part 1, Section 3.F.1, p. 21. Selection of Referees for External Evaluations. *Because the choice of external referees is critical to evaluating the candidate, the following guidelines should be observed:*

##### *Quality of Referees*

- *Referees should be from strong departments at major research institutions, such as those typically found among Research 1, AAU, or premier foreign institutions. All referees from universities must be full professors or equivalent (for example Readers at a British University) with outstanding scholarly accomplishment in the candidate's field.*
- *If referees are from industry or government, they should be of a similar stature to a full professor at a major research institution, and this should be justified in the biographical paragraph about the reviews.*

*Deviations from the above guidelines are permissible only if a proper evaluation of the candidate's work would not otherwise be possible. For example, if a candidate's field is so small that it will not be possible to find at least 5 referees satisfying the above criteria who have the expertise necessary to evaluate a candidate's work; or in situations where a faculty member is well known in the profession, it may be difficult to find leading scholars who do not have some kind of an association with the candidate. Such deviations must be explained in detail. Simply saying "the field is too small" does not constitute an adequate justification.*

##### Adopted text:

Policy Part 1, Section 3.F.1, p. 21. Selection of Referees for External Evaluations. *Because the choice of external referees is critical to evaluating the candidate, the following guidelines should be observed:*

##### *Quality of Referees*

- Referees should **demonstrate significant scholarly accomplishments in the candidate's field** and be from ~~strong~~ departments at major research institutions, such as those typically found among Research 1, AAU, or premier foreign institutions. All referees from universities must be ~~full professors or equivalent (for example Readers at a British University) with outstanding scholarly accomplishment in the candidate's field~~ **at or above the proposed rank of promotion, with a preference, whenever possible, for full professors in all cases.**
- If referees are from industry or government, they should be of a similar stature to **an associate or full professor (as appropriate)** at a major research institution, and this should be justified in the biographical paragraph about the reviews.

*Deviations from the above guidelines are permissible only if a proper evaluation of the candidate's work would not otherwise be possible. For example, if a candidate's field is so small that it will not be possible to find at least 5 referees satisfying the above criteria who have the expertise necessary to evaluate a candidate's work; or in situations where a faculty member is well known in the profession, it may be difficult to find leading scholars who do not have ~~some kind of an association~~ a substantial collaboration with the candidate. Such*

deviations must be explained in detail. Simply saying "the field is too small" does not constitute an adequate justification.

*Candidates are allowed to provide to the paper preparer a list of names, institutions, or departments from which external evaluators may be selected; final decision on the solicitation of external referees is made by the paper preparer.*

## 5. Voting participation in departments:

### Original text sections:

Section F.4. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees. *Departmental bylaws or other documents covering P&T policies and procedures may be accessed by the Unit Executive Officer to establish a promotion and tenure committee, consisting of at least three eligible faculty and where more than three eligible faculty exist, a seventy-five percent quorum is required to review and vote on promotion and tenure cases. A college dean may apply an exception when warranted. In small units (those with fewer than three eligible voters) the Dean, with appropriate advice, must establish a promotion and tenure committee that includes faculty from other departmental or campus (UIC) units who are qualified by expertise and who meet all other eligibility standards according to the rules outlined above. If there is a split vote, the rationale for the vote must be addressed in the letter of the unit executive officer or the unit P&T committee.*

Section F.5. College Promotion and Tenure Committees. *College bylaws or other documents covering P&T policies and procedures may be accessed by the Dean to establish a college promotion and tenure committee consisting of at least three eligible faculty and where more than three eligible faculty exist, a seventy-five percent quorum is required, in addition to an executive committee (where appropriate), to review and vote on promotion and tenure cases. A college dean may apply an exception when warranted. In small colleges where there are fewer than three eligible voters on the college committee, the Dean, with appropriate advice, must establish a promotion and tenure committee that includes faculty from other campus (UIC) units who are qualified by expertise and who meet all other eligibility standards according to the rules outlined above. In any instance of a split vote, the rationale for the vote must be addressed by the dean or the College P&T Committee.*

### Adopted text:

Section F.4. Departmental P & T Committees. ~~Departmental bylaws or other documents covering P&T policies and procedures may be accessed by the Unit Executive Officer to establish a promotion and tenure committee, consisting of at least three eligible faculty and where more than three eligible faculty exist, a seventy five percent quorum is required to review and vote on promotion and tenure cases. A college dean may apply an exception when warranted. In small units (those with fewer than three eligible voters) the Dean, with appropriate advice, must establish a promotion and tenure committee that includes faculty from other departmental or campus (UIC) units who are qualified by expertise and who meet all other eligibility standards according to the rules outlined above.~~ *The Unit Executive Officer will establish a P & T committee consisting of all eligible faculty (at least 3 members) and, for committees larger than 3 members, a seventy-five percent quorum is required to review and vote on promotion and tenure cases. In small units (those with fewer than three eligible voters) the Dean, with appropriate advice, shall establish a P & T committee that includes faculty from other departmental or campus (UIC) units who are qualified by expertise and who meet all other eligibility standards according to the rules outlined above. For large Departments (>50 eligible faculty members) faculty-elected sub-committees consisting of at least 75% of eligible faculty members or 35 eligible members, whichever is less, will review and vote on P & T cases. Any process variation other than a faculty-elected sub-*



*committee shall be approved by the Provost. If there is a split vote, the rationale for the vote must be addressed in the letters of the unit executive officer and the unit P&T committee.*

Section F.5. College Promotion and Tenure Committees. *College bylaws or other documents covering P&T policies and procedures may be accessed consulted by the Dean to establish a college promotion and tenure P & T committee consisting of at least three twelve six eligible faculty and where more than three eligible faculty exist, a seventy five percent quorum is required, in addition to an executive committee (where appropriate), to review and vote on promotion and tenure cases. A college dean may apply an exception when warranted. In small colleges where there are fewer than three eligible voters on the college committee, the Dean, with appropriate advice, must establish a promotion and tenure committee that includes faculty from other campus (UIC) units who are qualified by expertise and who meet all other eligibility standards according to the rules outlined above. In any instance of a split vote, the rationale for the vote must be addressed by the dean or the College P&T Committee, for which, a seventy-five percent quorum is required to review and vote on promotion and tenure cases. For those colleges that have an additional executive committee as a mechanism to include the review of cases from regional campuses, a seventy-five percent quorum is required to review and vote on promotion and tenure cases. In small colleges where there are fewer than twelve six eligible voters to serve the college committee, the Dean, with appropriate advice, must establish a P & T committee that includes faculty from other campus (UIC) units who are qualified by expertise and who meet all other eligibility standards according to the rules outlined above. An exception to this requirement may be requested from the Provost for cases in which the numbers of the external members from other colleges are greater than those within the college. In any instance of a split vote, the rationale for the vote must be addressed by the dean and the College P&T Committee.*

## **6. Inclusion of a statement of diversity, equity, and inclusion.**

Form and guidelines for the preparation of a diversity, equity, and inclusion statement are attached at the end of this document.

## **7. Emphasis that Department Heads/Chairs cannot veto a faculty member's opportunity to apply for promotion from Associate to Full Professor.**

### **Current text:**

Section C.2.b: Review of Tenured Faculty for Promotion in Rank to Full Professor. *A tenured Associate Professor may request a departmental review for eligibility for promotion in rank at any time. The Annual Evaluation of Faculty at UIC, or any additional evaluations required by a college or departmental bylaw or policy statement may be treated as an equivalent provided that the process addresses a candidate's questions about eligibility for promotion. If there is disagreement between the candidate and the Unit Executive Officer regarding a candidate's readiness, the Executive Officer should have a candid conversation with the candidate outlining the basis of his or her assessment. If the candidate still wishes to proceed he or she should be reviewed according to the standard procedure. Tenured Associate Professors are urged to give serious consideration to their Unit Executive Officer's assessment of their readiness before moving forward.*

### **Adopted text:**

Section C.2.b: Review of Tenured Faculty for Promotion in Rank to Full Professor. *A tenured Associate Professor may request a departmental review for eligibility for promotion in rank at any time. The Annual Evaluation of Faculty at UIC, or any additional evaluations required by a college or departmental bylaw or*

February 19, 2021

*policy statement may be treated as an equivalent provided that the process addresses a candidate's questions about eligibility for promotion. If there is disagreement between the candidate and the Unit Executive Officer regarding a candidate's readiness, the Executive Officer should have a candid conversation with the candidate outlining the basis of his or her assessment. If the candidate still wishes to proceed he or she should be reviewed according to the standard procedure. Tenured Associate Professors are urged to give serious consideration to their Unit Executive Officer's assessment of their readiness before moving forward. However, it is ultimately the decision of the candidate as to whether to go forward with promotion: neither UEO nor anyone else may prevent a candidate from seeking promotion.*

February 19, 2021

**Candidate's Statement on Efforts To Promote Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**

The candidate should provide examples of scholarship, research, teaching, creative activity, or service relevant to the institutional commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion, and describe his/her/their plan for future activities.

**(Fit on one page; no smaller than 10 pt font. It can be included as a separate page. It is not necessary to add page numbers in this section.)**

## **GUIDELINES FOR CONSTRUCTING A PERSONAL STATEMENT OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION**

Given that diversity, equity and inclusion are foundational at UIC, all faculty must include in their dossiers a personal statement on their philosophy, commitment, and work to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion at UIC. Both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty are required to provide this statement as part of the promotion process.

The guidelines below offer a general framework for faculty members in describing their contributions to institutional diversity, equity, and inclusion in their personal statements.

This statement is mandatory for all new faculty so as to encourage all faculty to actively support and promote UIC's institutional goals of diversity, equity and inclusion. The statement is optional for those faculty hired before August 16, 2021. Many faculty across campus are already engaged in work promoting diversity, equity and inclusion, and the addition of this statement in the Promotion dossier provides a mechanism to recognize the broad contributions of our faculty across all disciplines.

The statement is intended to broadly encompass efforts in diversity, equity and inclusion. It can reflect:

- Service, research, and/or teaching,
- activities at UIC or within academic and professional associations, non-profit, governmental, and/or private sector organizations, or representing UIC within the community,
- efforts addressing a wide range of equity and inclusion issues.

### **Definitions of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion**

Diversity: The UIC strategic Diversity plan, *A Mosaic for UIC Transformation*, defines diversity as the totality of the ways that people are similar and different, including race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation and identity, disability, national origin and citizenship status, age, language, culture, religion, and socioeconomic status, particularly when those similarities and differences are used as a basis for unfair advantage and inequity. UIC has a firm commitment to providing access to groups that have been historically under-represented, excluded, marginalized, or otherwise discriminated against in higher education.

Inclusion: Refers to the process whereby different groups feel welcome and valued in a given environment. In an inclusive environment, people feel that they are seen, that they belong, that their voice counts, that they have leverage, and that they are able to participate in decisions that impact their lives . Building inclusive environments often requires redesigning curricula and creating innovative learning environments, rethinking pedagogy, and mentoring intentionally and holistically.

Equity: Equity work assumes that we don't all start from the same place and attempts to address this imbalance by working towards providing equality of opportunities and pursuing the elimination of disparate outcomes for members of historically marginalized populations (by race, gender, disability, sexuality, etc). Equity work requires reducing or eliminating the institutional, social, financial and physical barriers that create and reinforce inequalities.

Diversity, equity and inclusion practices may vary considerably by discipline and unit. The guidelines below are intended to assist individual faculty, units, and committees in implementing and evaluating faculty contributions.

## **RESEARCH**

Examples of scholarship, research or creative activity related to institutional diversity, equity and inclusion might include:

- Research or creative activity in a faculty member's area of expertise that involves inequalities or barriers for inclusion for underrepresented groups.
- Grantsmanship that provides funding for research that focuses on equity, inclusion, and diversity.
- Studying patterns of participation and advancement of women and minorities in fields where they are underrepresented.
- Studying socio-cultural issues confronting underrepresented students in college preparation curricula.
- Evaluating programs, curricula, and teaching strategies designed to enhance participation of underrepresented students in higher education.
- Research that addresses issues such as race, gender, diversity, and inclusion.
- Research that addresses health disparities, educational access and achievement, political engagement, economic justice, social mobility, civil and human rights.
- Research that addresses questions of interest to communities historically excluded by or underserved by higher education.
- Artistic expression and cultural production that reflects culturally diverse communities or voices not well represented in the arts and humanities.

## **TEACHING**

Specific examples of evidence that faculty might use to show their contribution to institutional equity and inclusion in the teaching area might include:

- Developing effective inclusive teaching strategies for the educational advancement of students from groups underrepresented in higher education.
- Developing courses or curricula materials that focus on themes of diversity, equity, and inclusion or the incorporation of underrepresented groups.
- Modifying existing curricula to include themes of diversity, equity, and inclusion of underrepresented groups whenever possible.
- Record of success advising and mentoring students or mentoring colleagues from groups underrepresented in the faculty member's discipline/profession.
- Evaluating programs, curricula, and teaching strategies designed to enhance participation of students from underrepresented groups.
- Leadership or participation in faculty workshops and /or inclusive classroom sessions to promote equity and inclusion.
- Participation in scholarship of teaching and learning activities, including workshops, research projects, conferences at the intersection of curriculum development and diversity.
- Serving as an advisor to programs such as Women in Science and Engineering, SACNAS, or other equivalent programs in all disciplines.



## **UNIVERSITY SERVICE**

Specific examples of service related to institutional equity and inclusion might include:

- Leadership in a professional organization's equity, inclusion, and/or diversity work.
- Membership on departmental or university committees related to equity and inclusion.
- Participation and/or leadership in university pipeline and/or outreach activities.
- Participation and/or leadership in efforts to increase participation of underrepresented students in undergraduate and graduate programs.
- Service for or joint initiatives with state or national organizations (e.g., American Economics Association Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession, National Society of Black Physicists) with an emphasis on equity and inclusion.
- Leadership in organizing departmental or campus-wide events that encourage self-reflection and education regarding issues of equity, inclusion.
- Participation and/or leadership in academic preparation, outreach, tutoring, pipeline or other programs designed to remove barriers facing women, minorities, veterans, people with disabilities, and other individuals who are members of groups historically excluded from higher education.
- Demonstrated leadership in strengthening ties with tribal colleges, Hispanic Serving and Minority Serving institutions in an effort to facilitate research and/or to enhance the recruitment and retention of underrepresented students, faculty and staff at UIC.
- Participation and/or leadership in recruitment and retention activities.

## **COMMUNITY SERVICE**

- Engagement in seminars, conferences, or institutes that address the concerns of women and under-represented minorities.
- Service on local or statewide committees and boards focused on issues of equity and inclusion.
- Presentations or performances for under-represented communities.
- Honors, awards, and other forms of special recognition such as commendations from local or national groups or societies representing under-served communities.
- The application of theory to real-world economic, social, and community development problems.
- Reciprocal engagement with organizations supporting under-served communities to achieve shared goals.

The above are offered as examples. The range of teaching, research, professional activity, and university and community service initiatives in which a faculty candidate might engage can include other activities carried out on behalf of UIC.