GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENTS, PROMOTION COMMITTEES AND CANDIDATES

THE PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE PROCESS

(Revised and Approved for Circulation, 30 March 2010)
(Amended language to Section IV circulated and approved 23 November 2010)
(Section V amended and approved by Executive Committee 7 June 2011)
(Section III amended and approved Executive Committee 4 October 2011)
(Executive Committee Review paragraph, Section II & III amended and approved Executive Committee 26 February 2013)
(Section Numbers & Formatting Updated 1 August 2013)

The Dean and Executive Committee have assembled this document to outline the promotion process for all faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure. The information is intended to offer practical guidance to chairs, departments, peer committees and, candidates. This document seeks to clarify the processes involved in preparing and reviewing tenure and promotion cases. It also offers advice on collecting and presenting the materials that most effectively document a promotion and/or tenure case.

I. Levels of Review

The University of Michigan is commonly described as “one faculty with three campuses.” A single Board of Regents for the three campuses constitutes the final level of review in all promotion and tenure cases. Ultimately, tenure and/or promotion are granted by the Regents. Yet this process begins with recommendations from the faculty colleagues in candidates’ home departments or programs. In practice, considerable deference has been paid to favorable recommendations forwarded by the Dean and Executive Committee to the University of Michigan-Flint Provost and Chancellor, and then to the President of the University and the Board of Regents. This is likely due to respect for the principle that faculty should serve as the primary evaluators of other faculty. However, it would be a mistake to assume that once the College forwards a favorable recommendation, it will always be supported at the higher levels at which it is also reviewed.

The levels of review in promotion and tenure cases include the following:

- Department or Peer Committee review. Tenured faculty in the home Department(s) at or above the rank to which promotion is being sought normally constitute the initial level of review in promotion and tenure cases. Where there are fewer than three tenured faculty in the home Department(s), the Dean, in consultation with the Department(s) and candidate will identify additional qualified faculty to constitute a peer committee. In cases of jointly-appointed faculty, the means by which a candidate will be reviewed will be clarified in a memorandum of understanding between the candidate, the appointing Departments or programs, and the Dean. In joint appointments tenure
review committees will generally be constructed in proportion to the appointment percentages of the faculty. In all instances, those reviewing and voting on the case should carefully and thoroughly review the candidate’s record. A Department or Peer Committee’s recommendation will normally be due in the Dean’s office as early in the Fall semester as is practical.

- **Executive Committee review.** If the Department or Peer Committee recommends promotion and/or tenure for the candidate under review (by majority vote), this group prepares a supporting memorandum that is forwarded, with the candidate’s notebooks, to the Dean’s office for Executive Committee review and recommendation. In the case of non-support, a similar letter outlining the deficiencies of the case will also be prepared and forwarded to the Dean and Executive Committee for information.

For reasons of timely receipt of external evaluations of scholarship, the Dean’s office will begin to solicit assessments of the candidate’s scholarship and creative work by late spring even though the formal Department or Peer Committee recommendation is not due until the last business day in October. *(External review of scholarship and/or creative work is discussed below in section V.)*

The Executive Committee consists of six members of the Governing Faculty recommended by the Governing Faculty and appointed by the Regents for three-year terms to advise the Dean on matters of promotions, appointments, budgets, strategic priorities, and a wide variety of policies affecting the College. Executive Committee members will normally begin individual review of promotion notebooks in October and November. The Executive Committee and the Dean will discuss promotion and/or tenure cases in November and December. These discussions occur in Executive Sessions closed to outside observers. After review of the notebooks, the Department or Peer Committee recommendation, external assessments of the quality of scholarship and/or creative work, and considerable internal discussion, the Executive Committee votes on the case. This vote constitutes its recommendation to the Dean. Depending on the vote, there are several possible outcomes:

- If the Executive Committee supports promotion and/or tenure, and the Dean concurs, the Dean’s office will prepare the necessary documents needed to forward the recommendation to the Provost and Chancellor.
- If the Executive Committee does not support promotion and/or tenure, and the Dean concurs, the Dean will meet with the candidate and his/her Chair or Peer Committee convener to explain the reasons for non-support, and also outline the candidate’s options for appeal and/or re-application for promotion and/or tenure in a future year. The Dean’s office will also prepare necessary documents for review by the Provost and Chancellor.
- If the Dean and Executive Committee do not agree, or if the Executive Committee recommendation is not unanimous, two recommendations regarding the case may be prepared. The Dean will be responsible for drafting the recommendation that reflects his/her analysis of the case, in consultation with concurring Executive Committee members. Executive Committee members who voted against the position taken by the Dean will be collectively responsible for drafting the recommendation that reflects their analysis of the case. While preparation of this additional letter is at the discretion of dissenting Executive Committee member(s), when the Dean’s recommendation does not reflect the Executive Committee majority, that majority will be required to prepare a separate recommendation.
Both recommendations are forwarded to the Provost and Chancellor with necessary documentation.

- **Provost and Chancellor Review.** This level of review normally takes place in January and February. If a favorable recommendation from the Executive Committee and Dean is supported by the Provost and Chancellor, the Dean will communicate this information promptly to the candidate and his/her Chair or Committee Convener. In the less likely event that the Provost and Chancellor do not accept the recommendation of the Executive Committee and Dean, the Dean will also communicate promptly with the candidate and Chair to explain the basis for the decision.

- **Presidential and Regental Review.** Within the University of Michigan system promotion and/or tenure is/are formally granted by the Regents on recommendation of the President, with the President presumably basing his/her recommendation on those made earlier in the process. Normally the Regents review and act on recommendations for promotion and/or tenure in May. In the event the Regents grant tenure and/or promotion, it is effective on the 1st of September in the year granted.
II. Candidate and Department Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure are responsible for establishing a record in teaching, research and/or creative work, and service that meets or exceeds the College’s standards for promotion and tenure. Candidates are also responsible for adequately and accurately documenting their record so that it can be carefully and thoroughly reviewed at all necessary levels. Standard forms of documentation that have been devised will be identified in this document.

Granting promotion and/or tenure has long-term programmatic, institutional and financial implications. College standards state that candidates’ qualifications should be judged “rigorously” (CAS P&T Standards, p. 3). This should occur not only at the Executive Committee and Dean levels, but also at the Department or Peer Committee level. Departments or Peer Committees that do not believe candidates meet approved requirements should not forward favorable recommendations with the hope the candidate might “get through”, or the belief that it is the Department or Peer Committee’s responsibility to forward a case, and the Executive Committee and Dean’s responsibility to turn it down. A recommendation at the Department or peer committee level that lacks credibility has the potential to undermine the integrity of the home Department(s) or program, and may cast doubt on the reliability of future recommendations from those units. Departments are expected to take primary responsibility for mentoring and guidance of junior faculty. In the area of teaching, Departments need to be proactive in developing regular means of peer evaluation of faculty who will be considered for promotion and/or tenure, and in devising means by which additional commentary from students and program graduates will be solicited. (CAS P&T Standards, items D & H, p. 2.) In the area of scholarship or creative activity, Departments should thoroughly familiarize junior colleagues with Department and College expectations. In service, Departments should advise junior colleagues regarding College expectations of “meaningful service” and “effective, high quality, productive service” (CAS P&T Standards, pp.1 & 4).

During a faculty’s probationary period, there are many routine assessments of overall progress that should give clear indications of whether a faculty is meeting expectations. These assessments include:

- Annual reviews, with Chair commentary
- Two and four-year reviews requiring direct assessments from the Department and progress reports prepared by the Dean and Executive Committee
- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Recommendations for reappointment constructed by the Department, normally in the faculty’s third year

In all pre-tenure assessments it is of the utmost importance that colleagues, Departments, and the Executive Committee strive to provide the clearest possible picture of areas in which the candidate is strong, and most especially areas in which the candidate is not meeting expectations, or only minimally meeting them. Faculty under review should actively seek clarification of comments or suggestions in reviews and should make concerted efforts to address any areas identified as not meeting expectations.

Given what can be a significant number of cases reviewed by the Executive Committee and Dean every year, thoroughness in documentation needs to be balanced with conciseness. Where possible,
representative and selective samples of evidence of achievements should be submitted. Both Departments and candidates are urged to present their materials in a concise, clearly organized manner. Promotion notebooks, largely the responsibility of the faculty, should include the following sections, in the following order:

1. A Table of Contents.
2. Department or Peer Committee Recommendation.
3. A Candidate Statement (including teaching philosophy) of up to five pages.
4. Candidate CV.
5. Notebook section on Teaching.
6. Notebook section on Scholarship and/or Creative Activity.
7. Notebook section on Service.

In preparing and documenting the promotion and/or tenure case, it is paramount that candidates, Departments and/or Peer Committees keep in mind the following:

- Once a candidate’s case moves outside the Department or program, colleagues inexpert in the candidate’s discipline will review it. Therefore, it is important that all statements explain and interpret evidence or material, particularly regarding scholarship and/or creative work, in an understandable, jargon-free manner.
- A candidate’s notebooks need to be thorough but not excessive; no more than two notebooks should be submitted.
- A Department and/or Peer Committee recommendation similarly should be thorough but not excessive. Three to five pages single-spaced should adequately document the case and support the recommendation. Candidates should also strive for as concise a personal statement as possible. Five pages, single-spaced, should be sufficient.
- Candidates and Departments and/or Peer Committees should also adhere to set deadlines and respond promptly to any requests for information or clarification from the Dean and Executive Committee. Reasonable extensions may be granted upon request to the Dean.
- While the candidate’s notebooks will be reviewed in their entirety, certain portions of the notebook will be scrutinized more heavily than others. The Department and/or Peer Committee recommendation and the Candidate’s own statement are among the most important portions of the notebook, as both summarize candidate strengths, achievements and growth as a colleague and faculty member, and should provide some indication of future development. Given the prominence of teaching excellence in the College’s promotion and tenure guidelines, the overall record devoted to teaching will be thoroughly and carefully reviewed. In the area of scholarly or creative achievement, the confidential external evaluations serve as validations of the quality for future growth and potential of the candidate’s scholarly and/or creative record. In service, documentation of substantive contributions—whether to the University, the community or the candidate’s discipline—are important in demonstrating the quality of the service activity.
- While the information that follows is intended to assist all those involved in the promotion and/or tenure process, it is unlikely to address every question that might arise. Candidates, Departments and/or Peer Committees should contact the Dean as questions or concerns arise regarding the promotion and/or tenure process, or requests for clarification of information in this document.
- The College desires the success of all faculty, in particular those at the Assistant Professor level.
III. **Department or Peer Committee Recommendation(s)**

Since recommendations of support or non-support for candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure should be based on careful analysis of the record presented in the case, it is important that faculty voting in the case identify their support or non-support by signing the recommendation that reflects their opinion. When a recommendation is unanimous, only one letter needs to be prepared, and it should be signed by all faculty voting in that case. When the recommendation is not unanimous, two letters will be prepared. The document(s) should provide a concise overview of the case, provide reasoned analysis, be signed by all concurring faculty, and be no more than five pages, single-spaced.

A Department or Peer Committee recommendation is normally written by the Chair or Peer Committee convener in consultation with faculty voting on the case. The Department or Peer Committee’s recommendation should:

- Explain and interpret the candidate’s record in teaching, professional development and service. The statement should address in specific terms how the candidate has met or exceeded the Department’s guidelines and the College’s standards for promotion and/or tenure. In the case of a recommendation of non-support, the statement should address in specific terms how the candidate has not met Department guidelines and the College’s standards for promotion and tenure.
- Explain the candidate’s role in assisting the Department or program and College achieve their respective missions. In the case of a recommendation of non-support, the statement should address the candidate’s shortcomings in support of the Department, program and College missions.
- For all recommendations, authors should summarize the decision-making process that produced the recommendation.

Information in sections below summarizing teaching, research and/or creative work and service expectations applies equally to construction of the Department or Peer Committee recommendation and the candidate’s personal statement. Once the Department or Peer Committee Recommendation(s) is/are in final form copies should be provided to the candidate.

a. **Teaching and Facilitation of Student Learning**

This section should describe and evaluate the candidate’s teaching. In so doing it should address all factors that will help the Executive Committee and Dean understand the candidate’s teaching as it relates to the relevant program(s) or Department(s). The description should address all relevant criteria related to teaching outlined in the Promotion and Tenure Standards document. As a general guide, the Department or Peer Committee recommendation should touch on both the mandatory and appropriate optional teaching criteria identified in the College’s promotion and tenure standards (CAS P&T Standards, pp. 2-3). Bear in mind, however, that the Dean and Executive Committee do not want a checklist, but rather a coherent statement regarding teaching and facilitation of student learning. The Department or peer committee recommendation should address:

- Classes taught, including labs, if relevant.
- The role of the classes in the curriculum.
· General instructional techniques.
· New course development.
· Program development or revision.
· Class sizes and composition.
· Teaching materials or techniques developed.
· Pedagogical conferences and workshops attended.
· Contributions to academic assessment.
· Advising responsibilities.
· Supervision of student research or theses (if applicable).
· Participation in/supervision of undergraduate research (if applicable).

Where a recommendation of non-support also needs to be prepared, the Department and/or Peer Committee should indicate the applicable inadequacies of the teaching record. Care should be taken to link analysis of the record clearly to CAS standards and expectations in the area of teaching.

b. Professional Development—Scholarship and/or Creative Work

Scholarship and/or creative accomplishment is defined by the candidate’s discipline(s). The Department or Peer Committee recommendation performs a vital role in interpreting that scholarly or creative record for individuals not familiar with the standards of the discipline. This recommendation should outline the candidate’s growth and development as a scholar or creative artist, clarify the importance of the work completed by the candidate, and outline the expected trajectory of future growth and development. When a recommendation of non-support also needs to be prepared, the Department and/or Peer Committee should indicate the applicable ways in which the candidate has fallen short of scholarly and/or creative expectations.

The recommendation should use clear, direct language that can be understood by faculty from multiple disciplines. Norms regarding scholarship and/or creative work within the candidate’s discipline(s) should be clearly articulated. In most promotion and tenure cases the standard forms of publication are refereed articles and monographs. However, there are many other valid forms of professional development and/or creative work. These should be articulated in standards developed at the Department or program level. For example, in some disciplines publications in “Proceedings” may carry more weight than in others. In fine arts disciplines, a creative product, often the result of extensive collaboration can carry significant weight, while in other fields sole authorship is highly regarded. Whatever the form of the scholarly or creative product, particular care should be taken to assess its value and significance. The Department should clarify the role of the candidate in professional collaborations.

c. Service to the Institution, Profession and Community

The service component in the College’s promotion and tenure standards derives from the University’s mission statement promoting ‘engaged citizenship,’ and also from the College’s collective commitment to a climate of shared governance. Our emphasis on service also draws on the University’s Carnegie designation as an “community engagement” campus. Our long institutional experience demonstrates that the College and University function more effectively and arrive at better decisions when faculty are routinely and meaningfully consulted. Promotion and tenure standards state that candidates “must establish a record of effective, high quality, productive service” (CAS P&T Standards, p. 4). Service is not
simply a matter of committee or task force membership, but of meaningful, substantive participation in activities that promote the welfare and betterment of the College, University, community or profession.

The Department and/or Peer Committee recommendation should therefore take the utmost care in documenting the service undertaken and completed by the candidate. For service that focuses largely on the Department or program, faculty colleagues will likely be in the best position to document the quality of the contribution. For Committee or task-force service, other members of that group will be able to comment authoritatively on the quality of the effort. For service to the profession, others within the same field (i.e., members of the same professional or scholarly organizations) should be able to document effort and overall contribution. For service to the community to be considered a strong component of the overall record, the contribution should be clearly related to the candidate’s area of expertise (i.e. a scientist lecturing on science-related issues at area high schools, or an artist serving on the board of a gallery.) When a recommendation of non-support also needs to be prepared, the Department and/or Peer Committee should indicate the applicable ways in which the candidate has fallen short of expectations for engaged service.
IV. Candidate Notebook (with order of presentation of materials)

The candidate notebook(s) present the substance of every promotion and tenure case. It is of the greatest importance that the record presented be complete, concise and easy to follow. Please present materials in the following manner:

- Use three-punch notebooks.
- Use identifying tabs as necessary to order sections and sub-sections.
- Do not staple items.
- Do not store bulkier items (like conference papers or article offprints) in plastic folders.

The Executive Committee and Dean understand that every promotion case is “a work in progress.” It is therefore appropriate for candidates to add relevant material to their notebooks after their initial submission. While it is expected that both the teaching and service records will be substantially complete at the point of submission, it is common to update the scholarly and/or creative portions of the notebook, particularly as additional article acceptances or “revise and re-submit” requests are received from journals, books contracts are signed, or the book published, or exhibit or performance information is received. As a practical matter, adding such material through the end of November should be sufficient to guarantee its full consideration by the Executive Committee and Dean. Such work in circulation or nearing publication should be included in the packets prepared for review by external reviewers.

Please use the following order of presentation for material included in the promotion notebooks:

1. **Table of Contents**
   - The Table of Contents should indicate the broad divisions of the notebook as separated by tabs

2. **Department or Peer Committee Recommendation**

3. **Candidate Statement**
   - The candidate statement is an important opportunity for faculty to write a synthetic and reflective summary of the candidate’s teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. It should not merely enumerate activities. Clear and coherent presentation of materials is immensely helpful to the Dean and Executive Committee in their review of the case. The candidate’s personal statement is the one of the most important documents in the promotion and tenure notebook.

   a. Candidates should construct their personal statement in light of the College’s and Department’s promotion and tenure standards.
   b. Candidates should discuss their teaching philosophy: approach, goals, and methods, and reflect on their growth and evolution as teachers over time.
   c. Candidates should discuss in what ways their scholarship, research and/or creative activity contribute to their field; how they have built upon their earlier accomplishments to develop further as researchers, scholars, or creative professionals; and what they expect to accomplish in the future.
d. Candidates should explain how their service reflects their strengths and commitments, and how their service activities have enhanced the institution, profession and/or community. They should also address their expectations of future service.

e. Candidates should discuss key connections among teaching, research, scholarly and/or creative interests, and service activities.

f. Candidates should strive for succinctness in presentation. The candidate statement should be no more than 5 pages, single spaced.

4. Candidate CV

A curriculum vitae (CV) outlines the candidate’s educational background, employment history, publication record, teaching responsibilities and service activities. The CV provides concise information to everyone who reviews the case. Since it will be seen by many people outside the area of specialty, candidates should adopt a standard format, as outlined below.

- **Format**
  - Use reverse chronological order in sections, with the most recent item listed first.
  - Use a pleasing, readable font in 11 or 12 point type.
  - Separate sections with blank spaces and/or defined headings (**bold** or **underline**).
  - Number pages.
  - Use a professional address.
  - Omit personal information (such as birthdate or marital status).

- **Sections** - Put sections in the order given below:

  i. Educational Experience: use reverse chronological order. Give the Institution (and location, if not obvious), degree, year, and area of study. Titles of thesis/dissertation should be included.

  ii. Professional Experience should be in reverse chronological order and include work directly related to goal of attaining promotion and/or tenure at UM-Flint.

  iii. Creative and/or scholarly work should be divided into subsections and items should be listed in reverse chronological order.

    - Provide subsections appropriate to the discipline. Some examples are: Refereed Publications; Articles in a Collection; Conference or Proceedings Publications; Published Abstracts; Juried Performances; Exhibitions; Presentations; Consultant Reports, etc. The clearest and most correct means of presenting this information will depend on the norms within the candidate’s field.
    - Note publications and/or creative work completed while at UM-Flint.
· Provide complete information, including all co-authors; year of publication; complete journal titles; citation information including volume and inclusive pagination.
· Be consistent in format.
· For exhibits, and other creative work, indicate date(s), location, prizes, and type of review/jury process.
· Include works in press or forthcoming in your list of publications, since these have been reviewed and accepted (but provide documentation of acceptance in the form of letters, contracts, etc.)
· Indicate current status of works in circulation, i.e. “Under review as of 15 March,” or “Revise and Re-submit as of 20 June”.
· List works in progress or earlier stages of development, with estimated completion dates and an indication of work remaining prior to completion.

iv. Teaching Experience should:

· Be organized into subject matter.
· Be designated by level.
· Be indicated by institution, if you have been a faculty member at more than one College or University.
· Include unique courses developed or substantially modified
· Include pedagogical grants.
· Include undergraduate or graduate research supervision.
· Include pedagogical workshops and conferences attended.
· Include, if applicable honors or Graduate Student or other theses and/or capstone projects, including the name of the student, and the title of the thesis.

v. Service: Include a section indicating significant service. Distinguish among Departmental, College and University service, relevant community service and service to the profession or discipline. Be sure to indicate where and when these activities occurred. Information on the contribution of the service activity should be noted in either the Department or Candidate statement.

5. Notebook Section on Teaching
The Executive Committee and Dean stress the importance of a synthesizing personal statement (and Department or Peer Committee statement). It is essential that all claims be supported with sufficient credible documentation. This data and documentation should be provided in the sections of the notebook devoted to teaching, research or creative activity, and service.

The College of Arts and Sciences promotion and tenure standards regarding teaching identify multiple indicators upon which a teaching record should be evaluated. At least eight of these apply to all candidates for promotion and/or tenure, with the rest being optional at the College level. Norms and expectations within the Department or program may render optional items mandatory. For example, teaching at the graduate level or involvement of students in undergraduate research may be expectations of faculty in certain disciplines.
The guidelines that follow are intended to address in greater detail items A through L of the CAS Promotion and Tenure Standards related to teaching (CAS P&T Standards, pp. 2-3). Though included in this section, the information contained here is relevant also to Departments and/or programs involved in the promotion process. It is presented to align with the CAS Promotion and Tenure Standards document.

A. Course syllabi. In cases where a course has been taught multiple times, candidates should include only the initial and most recent syllabi for the course. Development of course syllabi will vary by individual and discipline, but all should include a course description and plan, learning outcomes and means by which student work will be assessed. Guidance regarding syllabi is also provided in two- and four-year reviews. The Executive Committee will take into account the degree to which earlier advice or recommendations have been implemented.

B. Select examples of course materials, such as lab manuals, assignments, sample exams, web-pages, CDs, as appropriate. The Executive Committee and Dean ask that candidates be selective in their choice of additional course materials so that the two-notebook limit is observed. Candidates might, for example, include materials for a single course, or single examples from several courses. What is selected should represent a candidate’s teaching at its best; these materials can be elaborated upon in the candidate’s or the department or peer committee’s statement, or in a brief headnote to the material.

C. Student evaluations. The guidelines given in the Promotion and Tenure Standards document provide the detailed information the Committee requests. The current evaluation and tabulation form provides appropriate comparisons. CAS administrative assistants currently prepare typed student comments. Original evaluations forms should not be included in the notebooks. Evaluations should be presented in groupings of courses taught, arranged in reverse chronological order (e.g., all sections of Psychology 100 grouped together in reverse chronological order followed by all sections of Psychology 201 grouped together in reverse chronological order, and so on).

D. Evaluations by faculty colleagues, conducted over a period of time. Peer evaluation is most valuable when it is consistent and occurs over an extended period of time. Departments should assess classroom effectiveness at least once per year. For tenure track faculty, more frequent observations are desirable. Evaluations should occur at all levels at which the candidate teaches. The Executive Committee and Dean encourage candidates to work with their Chairs to identify appropriate observers of their teaching, but it is a Department responsibility to carry out these observations. The need for peer evaluations applies also to the teaching effectiveness of Associate Professors who will be candidates for promotion to Professor. The policy used for review and evaluation of LEO faculty, (LEO Classroom Observation Policy), may be helpful to Departments in formulating appropriate guidelines.
E. Evidence of contributions to course development or revision and/or program development or revision. Candidates can best summarize how and why they have developed or revised courses in their candidate statements. Candidates may wish to make reference to:

- Courses developed at UM-Flint (this includes existing courses new to the candidate).
- Courses new to the curriculum.
- Revision of existing programs.
- Development of new programs.

Department or peer committee statements should comment on the value of courses and/or programs developed and/or revised. The College expects that all faculty members will engage in ongoing reflection about their teaching. Further, there should be promise or evidence the candidate for tenure or promotion will continue to grow and develop as an effective teacher.

F. Evidence of active engagement in the academic assessment process. Candidates should describe their involvement in the academic assessment process. At its most basic level, academic assessment is the faculty’s best effort to ensure students meet the learning outcomes identified for courses and programs. If evidence suggests outcomes are not being met, academic assessment asks that faculty consider possible changes to curriculum and/or pedagogy that would address the deficiency. Program assessment is the collective responsibility of all faculty teaching in the program. Engagement in academic assessment at the program/department level may include data collection, its analysis, discussion of results by program faculty and preparation of annual assessment reports. Faculty may also contribute at the College or University level through committee or task force service, or conference participation/attendance related to academic assessment. Department-based work on assessment is best documented in the candidate’s statement and in Department or peer-committee recommendations.

G. Evidence of involvement in academic advising. The ties created between faculty and students are among the most important connections made in the College. While the classroom or laboratory are primary seats of instruction, valuable connections with students are often fostered outside the classroom. Faculty should become proficient in knowing and communicating the requirements within the programs in which they regularly teach, and in general education, and should be able to advise students accurately about these requirements. Advising occurs not just during periods of formal registration, but throughout the academic year. Advising often will go far beyond these basics or program requirements to include office or e-mail contacts with students concerning coursework and careers; faculty may write letters of support and engage in educational counseling. A faculty member need not see a specific number of advisees, but in general the advising load within a Department or program should be as evenly distributed among available faculty as is practicable. Faculty may wish to log actual appointments for their own records, and summarize this information in personal statements. Departments or peer committees should comment on the faculty member’s effectiveness as an academic advisor.
H. **Select and limited commentary from students and alumni with information about how obtained.**

As faculty and Departments or programs consider inclusion of commentary from students other than written comments in course evaluations, care should be taken to weigh the value of the commentary against its volume. Individual letters of commendation from students should be used sparingly. Efforts generated by the Department to secure commentary from a statistically significant number and type of students and graduates may be of greater value than a large number of unsolicited individual letters or e-mails. Faculty and Departments considering inclusion of student materials should be aware of the broad provisions of FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act)\(^1\) that require a student’s consent to use information when that information has the potential to identify the student, or when that information is the sole property or possession of the student. Faculty are advised to secure such permission routinely for any material they believe they might include in a promotion and tenure package, but are not obligated to submit such permissions with the promotion and tenure notebooks. (E-mail consent from students is sufficient.) For purposes of the Executive Committee review, “Golden Apples” from students are of limited value. At the point of the tenure review some Departments solicit feedback from students in a more statistically significant and objective manner.\(^1\)

I. **Evidence the faculty has engaged students in undergraduate research or creative activities which go beyond stated degree requirements, if applicable.** The College strongly values engagement of undergraduate students in research or creative activities, but recognizes such endeavors may not be appropriate or practicable in all areas of study, or with all students. Examples of student involvement in research or creative activity include, but are not limited to: co-authorship on scholarly articles, serving as a research assistant, data collection and fieldwork, support for student presentations or posters at academic and undergraduate conferences, and student performance in appropriate venues.

J. **Evidence of active engagement with graduate programs, if appropriate.** An increasing number of graduate programs in the College, many of an interdisciplinary nature, provide faculty with opportunities to teach at this level. In general, faculty will be made aware of graduate level teaching expectations or opportunities at the point of hire. In some cases the program will be developed after the faculty’s arrival. Graduate level instruction is not more highly valued than undergraduate-level instruction. Evidence of teaching excellence at a variety of levels of instruction is most desirable. Engagement with graduate programs may also extend to serving as program faculty or Director, to course or curriculum development, or to committee service primarily related to graduate programs or instruction (i.e., the Graduate Programs Committee).

K. **Evidence the candidate utilizes appropriate technology in a manner that enhances teaching and learning.** Student learning is the primary goal of academic instruction. The use of technology may

---

1 The Psychology Department contacts all students whose theses the candidate has supervised; the Math Department randomly selects students from course rosters, and invites them (by letter) to comment on the faculty’s teaching.
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help faculty achieve particular goals more readily, or may provide more efficient means of communicating with students. Also, as students become more technologically literate, it is important for faculty to maintain their own currency with available technological resources that may enhance teaching and learning. The College understands such resources to be tools in aid of particular end results. Thus the use of technology by itself does not advantage a candidate’s case. Clarifying how the technology enhances teaching and learning in a coherent candidate (or Department or Peer Committee) statement is of more significant value. The College values courses being made available in an online format, but recognizes not all subjects can be effectively taught (or learned) in such a venue.

L. **DVD, video or audio documentation of classroom activities, processes, or productions, if appropriate.** In some instances written communication is inadequate to demonstrate teaching effectiveness. For certain forms of instruction, particularly those involving performance or production of creative work, DVD or video documentation may be most appropriate.

*Please note that the College’s Promotion and Tenure guidelines state: “Additional materials that testify to effective teaching and learning are welcome, but should be used selectively”* ([CAS P&T p. 3](#)).

6. **Notebook Section of Scholarship and/or Creative Activity**
   The section on scholarly and creative activities should put accomplishments in context. The guidelines below are indeed to provide helpful advice in addressing [CAS Promotion and Tenure Standards](#). Candidates should:

   a. Describe areas of expertise and current professional interests
   b. Clarify the significance or importance of the research and/or creative activity.
   c. Indicate whether publications/performances/exhibits are refereed, peer-reviewed or juried.
   d. Describe the procedures, traditions, and reputations of the discipline’s journals, professional meetings, and other organs of communication. For example, in many fields, publications in conference proceedings are not as highly regarded or rigorously reviewed as publications in journals. Yet in some other fields, publications in certain proceedings volumes are considered prestigious. Norms within the field should be clarified for Executive Committee members.
   e. For creative work, interpret the significance of exhibitions and performances.
   f. In cases of multiple authorship or team activity, clearly describe the candidate’s role in development or production of the final product. For example, in a jointly-authored and/or researched article, candidates should clarify to the greatest extent possible, what portion of the research, writing or revision they undertook.
   g. Summarize professional norms with respect to multiple authorship or team activity, if appropriate.
   h. In cases where community outreach forms part of the professional development case, the role of the department in deciding the significance, appropriateness, and usefulness of the candidate’s work is critical. To be considered part of professional development, applied research and community outreach activities must result in a document or product that can be
submitted to outside reviewers. If no concrete product is produced by the activity, it probably should be included in community service instead of professional development.

7. **Notebook Section on Service**

Service at program, Department, College, and University levels is relevant, as is professional service and community service that relates to the candidate’s areas of expertise. In addition, service should be discussed in relation to the mission of UM-Flint, the goals of the Department or program, and the professional development of the candidate. Care should be taken to document the quality and effectiveness of the service activity, and in particular, the contribution made by the candidate. For example, membership on the College Appeals Panel would not be judged significant unless the candidate actually provided service in an appeal. Documentation of service can take many forms, including (for example):

a. The product of the service, in the form of a policy change, report, or faculty or staff hire,

b. A summary of the service provided by the candidate, or

c. A letter outlining the service activity and candidate’s contribution written by the Committee or task force chair, or another member involved in the activity.
V. The Process of External Review of Scholarship and Creative Work

A. Choosing Reviewers:

The University of Michigan-Flint, as part of the University of Michigan system, requires a minimum of five confidential external review letters of a candidate’s scholarship and/or creative work. College practice is to secure six or more external review letters. Guidelines regarding the external review process are updated annually in a memorandum issued by the Provost of the Ann Arbor campus. This document is modified accordingly to reflect current University of Michigan system practice. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure should annually check this section of this document as restrictions and guidelines regarding external reviewers are regularly modified.

The list of qualified reviewers is to be prepared by the Department or Peer Committee in consultation with the candidate. Candidates may be in the best position to identify qualified individuals sharing their area(s) of scholarly or creative expertise, but it is appropriate for the Department to identify other individuals it deems qualified, and it is important for the integrity of the process for the Department to be actively involved in preparation and approval of the list of potential reviewers. At least two of the external reviewers that submit a letter, must be selected solely by the Department, without input from the candidate.

Once an individual is under consideration for service as an external reviewer, neither the candidate nor the department should be in direct contact with that individual. This includes inquiries about whether the individual would be willing to serve as an external reviewer. Direct contact is the responsibility of the CAS Dean’s office.

External reviewers must be highly qualified scholars or creative artists in the candidate’s field(s) who can assess the quality and impact of the scholarly or creative record of candidates for promotion and/or tenure. External reviewers must not have close personal or professional affiliations with candidates as such connections may influence the reviewer’s assessment.

An initial list of potential reviewers should consist of ten to twelve individuals, presented in priority order, with the following information provided about each:

- Name.
- Current academic rank or professional qualification. The academic rank must be greater than, or equivalent to, the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion. That is, Associate or full Professors hold the appropriate rank for candidates seeking promotion and tenure as Associate Professors. Full Professors hold the appropriate rank for candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Professor.
- Current academic or professional affiliation, i.e. Professor of English, Brown University; Director, National Institutes of Health; Curator, Sloan Museum, etc.
- E-mail and/or website address.
- Mailing address.
- Candidate’s prior associations with the reviewer.
Reasons reviewer is qualified to assess the candidate's scholarship. Here it is most helpful to the Executive Committee if, in addition to listing the reviewer's areas of scholarly expertise, some information about the reviewers' past publications, achievements or standing in their field is provided.

In general, reviewers should be established scholars or creative artists of recognized achievement. They should possess the expertise that enables them to evaluate the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarship or creative work. The Executive Committee asks that lists be made up of individuals who work at academic institutions that would generally be considered comparable to, or superior to, the University of Michigan-Flint in academic profile. The Executive Committee also looks for a broad national or world-wide distribution of scholars. A significant number of potential reviewers from Michigan, or even the Midwest, might generate a request for a wider range of potential reviewers.

Prior associations with the candidate are not forbidden, except for the circumstances noted below. Prior contacts of a professional character are appropriate. These kinds of contacts include, but are not limited to, attendance or presentation of papers at the same conferences or within the same conference sessions, attendance at the same seminars, professional consultations on topics of mutual scholarly or creative interest, service on the same advisory boards or membership in the same professional organizations.

All reviewers must be "arm's length" and should be current in their fields. To that end, the following categories of individuals are not acceptable as reviewers:

- Relatives of the candidate.
- Personal friends of the candidate.
- Co-authors within the last ten years.
- Major research collaborators within the last ten years.
- Dissertation Directors or mentors.
- Emeritus/Emerita faculty.
- Current or former faculty colleagues
- Former undergraduate or graduate teachers of the candidate.

Candidates and Department or Promotion Committee Chairs in any doubt about qualifications or appropriateness of an external reviewer are strongly encouraged to discuss these questions with the Dean in advance of submitting the list of potential external reviewers. Also, the appropriateness of reviewers who do not hold an academic appointment or whose credentials are non-traditional should be discussed and reviewed in advance with the Dean. This is not an effort to exclude such individuals, but to ascertain that such individuals will be deemed acceptable as external reviewers. The primary criterion for inclusion of individuals as potential external reviewers is their capacity to critically and objectively evaluate the quality and impact of the scholarly or creative product. The candidate and home department are responsible for arguing on behalf of a particular individual's qualifications. The Dean and Executive Committee will approve no more than one external referee with non-traditional qualifications. If individuals with non-academic or non-traditional appointments are included and utilized as external referees, the Dean’s office will seek a minimum of five further external referees with appropriate academic credentials and appointments.
The list of potential external reviewers will be submitted to the CAS Executive Committee for its review. The Committee may recommend re-prioritization. After the list of external reviewers is submitted to the Dean’s office, candidates and their departments or peer committees should not seek contact with these individuals. It is recognized that in the natural course of scholarly or creative interaction, potential reviewers may contact the candidate, and that some reviewers choose to self-identify. It is also recognized that normal scholarly or creative commitments, such as academic conferences, exhibit openings or theatre festivals may bring candidates into contact with potential reviewers. Such contacts do not disqualify these individuals from serving as an external reviewer.

After receipt of the list of proposed external reviewers, the Dean will share it with the Executive Committee. The Committee and Dean may re-prioritize the list of reviewers, or request additional clarification from the candidate, Department or Peer Committee. Once the list is approved, the Dean's office will begin contacting reviewers as needed. (Please see Appendix One for sample e-mails and letters sent to external reviewers.) In some cases it is necessary for the Dean and Executive Committee to request names and credentials of additional potential reviewers. This occurs when fewer than five or six of those contacted agree to serve as an external reviewer. It is in the Department’s and candidate’s interests to provide more potential reviewers than are likely to be needed.

B. Preparing Portfolio for Reviewers:

It is the candidate’s responsibility to prepare portfolios of scholarship and/or creative work that can be forwarded to reviewers once they agree to review a candidate's work. For Assistant Professors seeking promotion to Associate Professor portfolios should include:

1. A current CV

2. All scholarship or creative work candidates view as part of their portfolio
   - All scholarship or creative work completed, accepted and published while at UM-Flint
   - Work written and accepted but not yet published may be included

3. Work submitted but not yet accepted may be included, but should be used sparingly

4. In a small number of cases agreements are made at the point of hire to include or "count" scholarship or creative work completed prior to arrival at UM-Flint. Unless such an understanding is in place, such work should play a limited role in a candidate's portfolio sent to external reviewers.

For individuals seeking promotion to Professor, the same general guidelines apply, although greater weight will be given to scholarship or creative work produced since the initial promotion. Inclusion of some earlier work may be useful in demonstrating scholarly growth, development and maturity. If the scholarly or creative record is extensive, the candidate may wish to be somewhat selective in choosing materials to be sent out for review.

C. Contacting Reviewers:

After materials are submitted to the Dean's office it is that office's responsibility to contact reviewers, secure their acceptance to evaluate the quality of the scholarship or creative work, forward materials,
and secure timely responses. If the Dean's office needs additional copies of portfolios it will contact the candidate. In recent years an increasing number of candidates have submitted their portfolios entirely online, but this is not a requirement. This does speed up reviewer access to these materials.

To the extent permitted by law, reviewer comments will be kept confidential. Under current policy the Dean, members of the CAS Executive Committee, and the Candidate's Department Chair or promotion committee convener have access to external review letters. As a practical matter, Departments and/or Peer Committees currently make their recommendations regarding promotion and tenure without having access to reviewer comments. Beginning in 2010 the Dean’s office will attempt to secure external reviews during the summer so that as many of these reviews as possible will be on file and available for the Chair’s review and summary to the remainder of the promotion committee. The Executive Committee in Executive Session normally reviews promotion and tenure cases in November and December. In its consideration of external reviewer comments, Executive Committee members will disregard comments made about the candidate's teaching or campus service (although evaluation of professional service is appropriate.) Committee members will also disregard any reviewer recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure. The Committee members' and Dean's focus will be on comments assessing the quality and significance of the scholarship or creative work, in accordance with the College's and the Department’s standards for promotion and tenure. The Committee will make its formal recommendation to the Dean after it has received at least five external review letters. Normally this occurs in December or early January.

At the conclusion of the promotion and tenure process for the campus, generally in late spring, candidates for promotion and tenure may request external review letters that are redacted to exclude references that could identify the referee. Original letters are forwarded to the Provost's office along with the promotion notebooks.
VI. Number of Applications for Promotion and/or Tenure

The College of Arts and Sciences defines a promotion and tenure review as occurring at the Dean and Executive Committee level. Certainly consideration and evaluation of candidate credentials must occur at the Department and/or Peer Committee levels, and those groups’ recommendation must be forwarded to the Dean and Executive Committee. There is no limit on the number of times that a Department or Peer Committee may discuss a candidate’s case. This discussion, whether occurring in formal or informal settings, does not constitute a promotion and tenure review as is defined here. The chief reason for this formal definition of a promotion and tenure review is that present practice within the College provides for the most comprehensive review of a candidate’s record at the College (Dean and Executive Committee) level.

Within the College of Arts and Sciences, an assistant professor may be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure at the Executive Committee and Dean level no more than twice. Also within the College, an unfavorable recommendation at the Department or Peer Committee level of a promotion and tenure case normally halts further review of that case. An unfavorable recommendation at the Department or Peer Committee level will be reported to the Dean and Executive Committee. In accordance with the procedures outlined in the CAS Standing Rules, section 5, paragraph 2, the Dean will review the unfavorable recommendation taken by the Department or Peer Committee to determine whether that recommendation should be re-considered. If the Dean does not believe grounds for reconsideration exist, the case will not be forwarded to the Executive Committee for a promotion and tenure review. Regardless of the Dean’s determination, the candidate retains options for appeal outlined in sections 5.1 to 5.4 of the Standing Rules of the Faculty.

When the first review at the College level occurs in what is defined as the candidate’s terminal year of appointment (the seventh year on the tenure clock in the College of Arts and Sciences), College-level review will occur only once. According to the language of SPG 201.50 (I.A.1.), “the [Academic] unit is obliged to conduct a tenure review during the seventh year” if no such review has previously occurred. Department or Peer Committee reviews occurring in the seventh year of a tenure-track appointment will be forwarded to the Dean and Executive Committee for a promotion and tenure review, regardless of Department or Peer Committee vote and recommendation.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, with Tenure: Departments and/or Peer Committees should forward a favorable recommendation for promotion and/or tenure only when, in its collective judgment, the candidate has met or exceeded all the criteria for promotion and/or tenure. That said, if the Executive Committee does not make a favorable recommendation in a promotion and/or tenure case forwarded to it for review, the candidate may request a second promotion and/or tenure review, which normally will take place the following year. The new case will commence at the Department or Peer Committee level. All applicable deadlines will apply, the candidate’s notebooks should be updated, and at least three additional external reviews will be solicited by the CAS Dean’s office.

A case that is forwarded to the Dean and Executive Committee for review, and is discussed in Executive session, will be deemed to have been reviewed, whether or not the Executive Committee has made a recommendation to the Dean. If a case is withdrawn by the candidate prior to a discussion occurring in Executive session, it will be deemed not to have been reviewed. As noted in Section I, Executive session
discussions normally occur in November and December. Candidates contemplating withdrawing their applications for promotion and/or tenure are advised to consult closely with the CAS Dean’s office, since these discussion dates are approximate.

Withdrawning an application for promotion and/or tenure will occur on written request by the candidate. This request should be addressed to the Chair of the Department or relevant Peer Review Committee (with a copy to the CAS Dean) if the case is still being considered at that level. If the case has advanced to the Dean and Executive Committee the request should be addressed to the Dean. Candidates should understand the implications of this action and so are encouraged to discuss the matter with the Dean of the College prior to requesting their promotion and tenure review be stopped.

Candidates for Promotion to the rank of Professor, with Tenure: There is no limit on the number of times an Associate Professor, with tenure, may apply for promotion to the rank of Professor, with tenure.

In rare cases faculty may be hired into the College at an advanced rank, but without tenure. In such instances the candidate, for tenure purposes, will be reviewed in accordance with the procedural guidelines outlined for Assistant Professors seeking promotion and tenure.

---

Some general guidelines regarding FERPA as applied to use of student work in promotion and tenure cases:

1) The provisions of FERPA apply to current or continuing students. Protection of student privacy does not extend to students who have graduated. However, surveys of students who have graduated should indicate the information is being gathered for use in the promotion and tenure case.

2) If students are not identifiable in the material used, there are no FERPA concerns. This includes unattributed comments in student evaluations, and could include e-mail or other communications from which student names are omitted.

3) Use of student work that is public (i.e., DVDs of musical performance or performance of a play) does not require student consent, while use of more private student work (i.e., recording of a performance intended solely for a class) does.

4) Use of student work that is entirely the student’s requires consent. Examples might include a student essay written for a class, or a presentation at an undergraduate conference.
Appendix One

Sample e-mail sent to reviewers:

The following message is being sent on behalf of Dr. D. J. Trela, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Michigan-Flint:

Dear Colleague:

Assistant Professor in Psychology, Dr. Maize Ann Blue, is a candidate for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Part of the University of Michigan-Flint’s tenure review process involves the solicitation of external reviews of the quality of a candidate’s scholarship or creative work. We need to collect these confidential assessments from a minimum of five external referees, and this is my reason for writing to you today.

Dr. Maize Ann Blue’s Department has recommended you as a potential reviewer. Attached you will find Dr. Blue’s CV and a list of the materials we would ask you to review. We are not asking that you recommend for or against this faculty’s tenure, but rather that you evaluate the quality and significance of the scholarship. We would also ask for your completed assessment by October 31st. In consideration of your time and expertise, we would be pleased to offer you an honorarium of $100. And since we solicit multiple reviews, finally, I would request that you consider accepting this offer even if you felt your own expertise extended only to a portion of the list attached.

Thank you in advance for your consideration, and please let me know if I might answer any questions.

Cordially,

D.J. Trela, Dean
College of Arts and Sciences
Professor of English Literature
University of Michigan-Flint
516 French Hall
Flint, MI 48502
810-237-6514
810-762-3006 (fax)
Sample letter sent to reviewers:

Dear Professor Spartan:

We are currently considering Assistant Professor Maize Ann Blue for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Faculty at the University of Michigan-Flint are promoted on the basis of teaching, research, scholarly and creative activities, and service. Recognition of the quality of their work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process. We value your candid assessment of Dr. Maize Ann Blue’s research accomplishments and future promise, including positive points and areas needing improvement. Your scholarly and professional judgments will play an important part in the Dean and Executive Committee’s evaluation of Dr. Maize Ann Blue for promotion.

Faculty at the University of Michigan-Flint carry an 18 semester hour teaching load during the academic year, or 20-22 contact hours in the sciences. Most faculty have at least two preparations per semester. Approximately 95% of credits generated in the College of Arts and Sciences are at the undergraduate level. As an institution we place strong emphasis on both teaching and research. While we do not expect candidates for promotion to present the volume of research demanded by a major research institution, the candidate’s work must be of high quality, make a recognizable contribution to the field and offer evidence of continued professional growth and productivity. More information about the University of Michigan-Flint can be found at: http://www.umflint.edu/

Based on the enclosed materials and any other knowledge you have of his work or professional accomplishments, we would like your candid evaluation of Dr. Maize Ann Blue's written and scholarly contributions in relation to others of comparable experience in his field. We will appreciate your comments on the following issues:

1) How do you know Dr. Maize and Blue? Describe your relationship with him. Are you colleagues, friends, collaborators, or some combination of all three?

2) Indicate the basis upon which your assessment is made, particularly if it is formed using material beyond that which we are sending you.

3) Evaluate the quality of the scholarship or creative work presented in this record.
   a. What are your impressions about the scholarly impact of the writings?
   b. Which, if any, of the publications do you consider to be outstanding?
   c. How would you estimate Dr. Douglas’ standing in relation to others in his peer group who are working in the same field?
   d. How would you evaluate Dr. Douglas’ service contributions to the discipline?

4) Explain how scholarly work in your field is most appropriately assessed, evaluated and ranked. What “counts” as scholarship and what does not? What work tends to count more than other work? As you’re no doubt aware, your letter will be read largely by individuals outside your field. Any guidance you can give in explaining scholarly standards in your field would be helpful to non-specialists.

Questions sometimes arise about the confidentiality of external review letters, and we do want to advise you that your letter will be reviewed by senior faculty at the University of Michigan. As a public
institution, legal considerations limit our ability to assure confidentiality; but it is our practice not to release external review letters unless required to do so by law.

I understand that your schedule is crowded, but responses from scholars such as yourself are invaluable to our promotion process. My colleagues and I would appreciate receiving your evaluation by October 1st. If you find yourself unable to meet this deadline, I’d ask that you contact me. Please include your curriculum vitae with your response.

My colleagues and I are grateful for your willingness to assist us in one of the most important tasks that we engage in as faculty members.

Yours cordially,

D.J. Trela, Dean
College of Arts and Sciences
Professor of English Literature