The College of Arts and Sciences desires the success of all its faculty, regardless of rank. The Dean and Executive Committee are particularly mindful of our need to oversee, monitor, mentor and guide assistant professors who need to build an outstanding record that will qualify them for promotion to the rank of associate professor, with tenure. To that end, and in order to provide appropriate and timely feedback to tenure-track faculty, the College long ago instituted formal two and four-year review processes that involve the candidate, the home department, the CAS Executive Committee and the CAS Dean. While the primary intent of these reviews is to provide guidance to candidates, these assessments are also intended to be carefully considered by the home department(s).

Guidelines for two and four-year reviews are necessarily linked to the College's Promotion and Tenure Standards (hereafter referred to as "Standards"), which focus on three primary areas of accomplishment: excellence in teaching and facilitation of student learning; high quality, significant scholarly and/or creative work, and a record of engaged and meaningful service to UM-Flint, the candidate's profession, and the surrounding community. Two and four-year reviews should be structured so as to address College expectations (sometimes defined as "thresholds") in these three areas. Departments' own promotion and tenure guidelines offer more discipline-specific information regarding these three areas. Candidates should work to meet their department’s expectations, especially concerning teaching and scholarship/creative work. In addition, "Guidelines for Departments, Promotion Committees and Candidates: The Promotion and Tenure Process" (amended as of November 2010, hereafter referred to as "Guidelines") is also an important document, both in general expectations set forth, and in more specific guidance provided regarding the organization and content of the two and four-year review notebook(s).

There are candidate responsibilities and department responsibilities in both the two and four-year review processes. In some cases, particularly for joint appointments, department responsibilities may be undertaken by a peer committee. Faculty who are involved in the review or assessment of their colleagues' progress towards promotion and tenure are directed in particular to Section II, "Department and Candidate Responsibilities," and Section III, "Department or Peer Committee Recommendations" of the "Guidelines" document. The guidance provided in these sections is by no means exhaustive. We encourage active and continuous mentoring on the part of senior faculty throughout a candidate's probationary period.

Tenure-track faculty are normally hired on an initial three-year contract, with an expectation of renewal for a second three-year contract based on a promising two-year review, and a department recommendation supporting contract renewal. While contract renewal for a second three-year term is not automatic, it is the norm. It is the Executive Committee and Dean's understanding that concerns identified
at the point of the two-year review are, in all but the most exceptional cases, remediable, and that candidates should be provided some time to make necessary corrections and adjustments to their teaching, or scholarly and/or creative activity program, or service. However, in some cases contracts may be renewed for less than three years, or the candidate may be given a terminal, one-year contract. Contract renewal normally occurs in the candidate’s third year of an appointment. The three-year contract renewal process is formally separated from the two-year review because the Executive Committee and Dean want this two-year review process to focus on the recommendations and guidance that is provided to the candidate.

At the point of the two-year review, faculty will be expected to have "settled-in" to their UM-Flint appointment, developed courses, modified teaching so as to have adjusted to students typical to UM-Flint, begun to make progress on their research agenda, and made appropriate beginnings in institutional, professional and community service. At the point of the four-year review, faculty should have made substantial progress towards meeting College expectations in teaching, service and research and/or creative activity. It is also expected that the framing of the review materials will closely resemble the format that will be used by candidates as they prepare their promotion and tenure notebooks.

**Construction of Candidate Portfolios: Norms and expectations regarding organization** of portfolio sections, quantities and types of supporting material, length of personal and department statements, are contained in the "Guidelines" document and should be scrupulously observed. Any exceptions will be noted on the Blackboard shell set up for you. Even if you plan on using a different method of submission, you should take note of these exceptions by logging onto Blackboard and reviewing your 2/4 year review site. You will be evaluated in part based on your capacity to condense, edit and encapsulate necessary information within prescribed limits. Please refer to pages 9-16 of the “Guidelines” for specific portfolio organization.

**Deadlines:** Two and four-year review notebooks are due in the Dean's office near the end of March – please see the current annual calendar on website for exact timing. For candidates with January (as opposed to September) hire dates, slightly later deadlines may be negotiated. The Executive Committee and Dean will make every effort to provide written responses to the review by mid-summer. After the review is issued, the Dean will meet with the candidate and his or her Chair.