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SCHOOL OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND STUDIES (SHPS)

I. INTRODUCTION

The School of Health Professions and Studies Tenure and/or Promotion document addresses criteria and review procedures for promotion to Associate Professor and Full Professor and the granting of tenure. The document serves two purposes:

- Specify general expectations for tenure and/or promotion which reflect the diverse nature of School of Health Professions and Studies programs; and
- Promote consistency in the tenure and/or promotion review process for School of Health Professions and Studies faculty.

II. CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

All faculty members in the School of Health Professions and Studies under review are evaluated in three major areas of performance consistent with SHPS’ mission and vision. The three major areas of performance are: (1) teaching effectiveness; (2) scholarly activities and professional development; and (3) service to the university, profession, and community. All faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching with significant achievement demonstrated in scholarly activities and service.

As the School of Health Professions and Studies is comprised of diverse academic programs, it is acknowledged that faculty have a wide range of academic backgrounds and professional experience. To accommodate these differences, individual programs may have program-specific promotion criteria which are congruent with the general criteria described in this document. However, all SHPS faculty are expected to demonstrate a recognizable commitment to the success of our students both inside and outside the classroom.

When considering request for promotion to associate professor with granting of tenure, supporting documentation of the professional record from the time of UM-Flint appointment will be reviewed by the tenure and promotion committee. In the event that the faculty member entered the UM-Flint as an associate professor, the teaching and service record will be reviewed since appointment to tenure track, and the entire record of scholarly activities will be reviewed with particular emphasis on achievements since hire.

When seeking promotion to full professor, emphasis will be placed on achievements since the last tenure and/or promotion decision. The difference between the ranks of associate and full professor is primarily one of achievement and significance of one’s contributions.

Activities appropriate for School of Health Professions and Studies faculty in each of the three major areas of performance are described in this document. These activities provide a measure of a faculty member’s contribution to the mission of the university, school, and department and to one’s profession or discipline. Because of the nature of the professional programs in the School of Health Professions and Studies, endeavors which enhance and broaden professional competency in all three of the major areas are valued. Consistent with the mission of SHPS,
interdisciplinary activities are highly valued. The assessment of the appropriateness of specific activities and the quality of a faculty member’s performance in these areas is the responsibility of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

A. Teaching

Broadly defined, teaching includes traditional classroom, clinical, online and distance education and non-class related teaching activities such as advising and mentoring; supervising student scholarly activities; serving on theses and dissertation committees; supervising independent studies; teaching of clinical faculty; and supervision and/or involvement in students’ clinical/practicum or internship education where the focus and location of the education is in the clinical or applied setting. Teaching activities in this applied (non-campus) category may include advising and meeting with students on or off site, evaluating the student’s learning situation, and acting in an advisory capacity to the off-campus clinical educator or preceptor.

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

A determination of teaching effectiveness is based on multiple sources of data collected over a period of time, including: subject matter knowledge; demonstration of effective presentation style; appropriate course design, planning and evaluation; adoption of meaningful assessment; and interaction with students. Student course evaluations obtained through departmentally approved methods are essential. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness may be demonstrated by:

- peer review of teaching. Peer evaluation of teaching may include direct observations, review of a teaching portfolio, and review of course syllabi and/or instructional materials.
- feedback from workshop participants.
- feedback from alumni.
- commendation letters from students.
- teaching awards.
- instructional contributions.
- syllabi, teaching material, and contributions to student products.
- documented contributions in the areas of advising and mentoring.
- participation in interdisciplinary teaching.
- evidence of the effectiveness of contributions related to curriculum and/or course development and outcome assessment.
- evidence of ongoing self assessment and improvement.

For full professors, the evidence is expected to reflect a higher development of leadership in these activities and others, including mentoring of junior faculty, dissemination of teaching innovations, development of professional standards, assisting with preparation for accreditation processes of professional programs, and provision of continuing education.

B. Scholarly Activities and Professional Development

Scholarship is broadly defined to include those activities that advance teaching, research, practice, or service through rigorous inquiry that is significant to the field, is creative, documented, and peer-reviewed through various methods. Scholarship encompasses any or all of
the following four categories – discovery, integration, application and teaching. Ernest Boyer’s (1990) concept of scholarship for the professoriate provides the framework for this area of performance due to its broad view of scholarship and its relevance to the mission of SHPS. The descriptions of scholarship noted below are derived from Boyer’s (1990) publication.

- Scholarship of discovery is aimed at the development or creation of new knowledge. It represents the traditional view of research, including primary empirical research, historical research, theory development and testing, methodological studies, and philosophical inquiry and analysis.

- Scholarship of integration connects disciplines, fitting one’s own or other’s research in larger intellectual patterns. It includes educating non-specialists, explaining/interpreting findings, doing original interdisciplinary work, conducting integrative reviews of literature, analyzing health policy, studying health care systems, conducting meta-analysis, or synthesis of literature from other disciplines.

- Scholarship of application is the use of knowledge in problem-solving in the professions, industry, government, and community. Findings of this scholarship are applied in teaching/learning and practice. It includes development of clinical knowledge such as development or application of theoretical formulations and conduct of clinically applicable research and evaluation studies, evaluation of systems of care, development of delivery modes, and taking leadership roles in developing practice that improves access to or delivery of health care.

- Scholarship of teaching produces knowledge to support the transfer of information from teacher to student. It is not teaching effectiveness; rather it is inquiry and/or reflection about teaching/learning, assessment, evidence gathering, peer collaboration and review, development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative teaching methods, program development, and outcome measurement.

Evidence of Scholarly Activities

Candidates for promotion are evaluated on the quality, and to a lesser extent, quantity of their scholarly activities/professional development. Work is expected to make a contribution to the profession/field/discipline, to interdisciplinary areas or to pedagogical endeavors. The Committee review is complemented by documentation from external reviewers.

Scholarly activities may reflect one or any combinations of the four aforementioned categories of scholarship. Although prior work will be considered, the primary focus of the reviews will be on the record of scholarly or creative activity while a faculty member at UM-Flint, or expanded since appointment at UM-Flint. Candidates must demonstrate promise of future productivity.

Evidence of scholarly activity may vary dependent on the focus of scholarship. Evidence must include, but is not limited to, publications in peer reviewed journals. Other evidence may include, funded (or approved) extramural grant proposals; invited or peer reviewed presentations; publications such as monographs, books, chapters in books, conference proceedings; workshops related to practice and areas of scholarship; manuscript reviews for
refereed journals; book reviews; consultation reports; clinical demonstration projects; policy papers and others.

For full professor, the individual is expected to demonstrate a sustained level of productivity and accomplishment as well as mentoring junior faculty in their scholarly pursuits.

Evidence of Professional Development Activities

Professional development is defined as the deliberate expansion of knowledge or skills in one’s field and may include participation in continuing education or in-service activities to assure professional competence. Professional development should reflect a blend of teaching, scholarly, and service activities. Evidence that professional development in one's field, or in areas of expanded interest, as a continuous process is expected.

C. Service to the University, Profession, and Community

School of Health Professions and Studies’ faculty are expected to provide service to the university, profession, and the community. Consistent with the mission of SHPS, professional service contributions to the Flint and regional community are valued as well as national and international contributions. Engagement in service activities at multiple levels is required. The quality and impact of service contributions is more important than the number of different service activities.

Service to the department, school or university may include administrative activities, participation on various committees, task forces, involvement in recruitment, accreditation, or other department, school or university projects or initiatives.

Service to the profession may include professional association activities, holding office, participating on task forces and committees, participation in site visits or other professional association accreditation activities, and writing items for registry, licensure, or certification exams.

Community activities include professional consultation, serving in appointed or elected positions in community groups related to health care, providing professional in-service training and workshops, and representing the profession or university before a variety of community groups. In general, activities which involve the contributions of faculty expertise in a community setting are recognized as community service.

For some professional faculty, participation in clinical activities, sometimes referred to as “faculty clinical practice”, may be required or desirable as part of the faculty role. This expectation, where relevant, may be an additional requirement for specific program faculty and be considered a service to the community. Outcomes or products of clinical practice, dependent on the nature of the contribution, may be considered as the scholarship of application.
Evidence of Service Activities

Documentation of the contribution to the university, profession, and community may include letters from those familiar with the significance of the contribution (e.g. leaders or recipients of service), written reports, or products of the service.

For full professor, demonstration of a consistent commitment to service and the potential for leadership in service activities and mentoring of junior faculty with regard to service activities is expected.

III. PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION REVIEW OF FACULTY

- A request for tenure and/or promotion review for faculty members with tenure-track appointments in the School of Health Professions and Studies shall be initiated by the faculty member’s Department Director who makes the request to the Dean no later than APRIL 1 of the winter term preceding the sixth year (see Attachment 1).

- The request for the tenure and/or promotion review shall be accompanied by a one-page summary of his/her accomplishments and current vitae of the faculty member.

- The request for promotion from tenure track Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is accompanied by a request for tenure.

- When an application for promotion is accompanied by a request for tenure, a tenure review must be initiated no later than the end of the first semester of the faculty member’s sixth year of University appointment to the tenure-track, counted according to “Rules Concerning Acquiring the Protection of Regents’ Bylaw 5.09 by Accumulating Years of Service” (Regents’ proceedings, September 1985).

- A tenure and promotion review request shall be made in accordance with the SHPS Tenure and/or Promotion Timeline, consistent with the Tenure and Promotion cycle established each fall by the Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs. (see Attachment 1).

- An “early review” is one which occurs prior to the fifth year since appointment or last promotion within the tenure-track. Consideration of an early review results from a consultation between the Department Director and the Dean. The faculty member must demonstrate that s/he has achieved a record of accomplishments which exceed the standards and level of performance that would be expected during the normal six years in rank. The request is submitted in the form of a one page letter including the rationale for the early review.

- After receiving a request from the Director for an early tenure and/or promotion review, the Dean in consultation with the Department Director will decide whether the record of the candidate merits a full substantive review for promotion and tenure.
A. Committee Membership

1. Appointment of Committee
   a) The Department Director will consult with the faculty member regarding potential committee membership.
   b) For both early and regular sequence reviews, the Dean in consultation with the Management Team will appoint Tenure and Promotion Review Committee and its Chair and inform the candidate of the committee membership.

2. Tenure and Promotion Review Committee
   The Tenure and Promotion Review Committee shall consist of five tenured faculty members, at least three of whom must be from the School of Health Professions and Studies. At least one but not more than two tenured faculties will be from the candidate’s department whenever possible. (For promotion from Associate to Full Professor, the majority of the committee shall be Full Professors.) Members of SHPS Management Team shall not serve.

   When the required minimum number of eligible tenured SHPS faculty is unavailable, tenured faculty from a similar discipline/field within UM-Flint will be selected. If necessary, a person from an outside institution with like mission could be selected. This person must accept the tenure and promotion standards for SHPS for the purpose of this review. In addition, a departmental resource person, identified by the department and subject to approval by the Dean, must be consulted by the committee to assist in the interpretation of departmental expectations and performance standards. The resource person will not be present for the vote.

3. It is the responsibility of the Committee Chair to fully orient all members to the details of the SHPS Criteria and Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion Review document. The Chair shall inform the committee that all discussions, materials reviewed and deliberations must be held in strictest confidence.

IV. PROMOTION REVIEW COMMITTEE FUNCTIONS AND PROCEDURES

A. Committee is Constituted as Per Guidelines.

B. Relationship Between the Dean and the Promotion Review Committee

The Dean may meet with the constituted committee at its inception. However, after this initial meeting, the Dean will only communicate with the Chair of the Promotion Review Committee, and these communications will be restricted to discussions of committee process.

C. Committee Process

See Timeline and Steps in Process - Attachments 1 and 2.
D. Portfolio

The portfolio, prepared by the candidate and submitted to the Dean according to the Timeline (Attachment 1), will be reviewed by the committee. Activities subsequent to initial appointment and/or last promotion should be clearly delineated in the following sections.

1. Introduction to Portfolio
   a) Table of Contents
   b) Description of organization of Portfolio
   c) Curriculum Vitae
   d) Narrative Statement describing the candidate’s professional career development
   e) Letter of Support from Department Director
   f) All previous formal reviews (i.e., annual reviews and two-year review
   g) Other documents (if any) requested by Ann Arbor

2. Teaching

A general description of courses and other teaching activities should be provided. For each course taught, syllabi, and student course evaluations need to be provided. Both the numerical ratings (including a measure of central tendency for each item) and typed copies of all student comments must be submitted. Interpretive/contextual statements regarding the evaluations as well as actions taken to enhance teaching effectiveness should be included. Course evaluation material and all additional evidence such as results of peer evaluation, syllabi, relevant course materials, and other sources of data noted in page 4 should be organized logically, typically by course and term or consistent with the narrative statement.

3. Scholarly activities and professional development

A general description of scholarly activities, including copies of publications and other scholarly products such as noted on page 5 should be included. Materials should be organized consistent with the narrative statement, and organizational format.

A description of significant professional development activities/materials since hire should also be included in this section.

4. Service

Evidence of university, professional and community service as noted in section C should be organized by type and level of service (i.e., university, school, department, profession and community) and in a manner consistent with the narrative statement, and organizational format.

E. External Reviewers

External reviewers are professionals in the disciplines or fields who possess the expertise to review the candidates work. External reviewers should not have a personal or close professional
association with the candidate and, whenever possible, should come from an institution with a similar mission.

1. **Identification of External Reviewers**

   The candidate will provide a list of names, academic rank, addresses, telephone numbers and email addresses of at least eight possible external reviewers, with areas of expertise specific to the candidates identified areas of scholarship. Included with the list will be a description of each reviewer’s relationship to the candidate, and whether an informal discussion about the review occurred. The list is submitted to the Dean according to the Timeline (Attachment 1).

2. **Contact of Reviewers**

   The Dean will make initial contact to ascertain willingness and ability to provide the service in the stated time frame.

3. **Committee’s Selection of Reviewers**

   a) It is the responsibility of the committee to determine the appropriateness of the reviewers provided by the candidate.
   b) If an insufficient number of acceptable names are provided to the committee, the committee chair will request a list of additional reviewers from the candidate and inform the Dean of this request.
   c) The committee will select at least five reviewers.
   d) Reviewers selected by the committee will be contacted by the committee chair to inform them of their selection to serve.
   e) The SHPS approved letter (Attachment 3), outlining the guidelines for the review, will be sent by the chair. The letter stipulates that the reviewers not make a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion; rather they evaluate the quality and contribution of the candidate’s scholarly products.

F. **Resources Associated With Committee Functions**

1. **Department resources**

   The candidate is responsible for assembling the portfolio. The cost of duplication of materials will be borne by his/her department.

2. **School Resources**

   The Dean’s office will assume costs of committee work, e.g. clerical support, duplication of materials for external reviewers, communication with external reviewers, final report, and reimbursement for mileage when an outside committee member is used.

G. **Committee Recommendation and Report**

1. The Chair of the committee shall prepare a written report addressing each of the three areas of performance.
2. The committee will recommend one of two outcomes, each requiring a majority vote: 
a) granting of tenure and/or promotion.
b) denial of tenure and/or promotion.

3. The actual vote will be conveyed to the Dean with the committee’s recommendation.

4. Rationale for the decision shall be included in the report along with committee members’ 
   signatures.

5. The chair of the committee will present the written committee report to the Dean and will 
   be available to provide any clarification if necessary.

6. In addition to the report, the Dean shall have access to the candidate’s portfolio, but not 
   to the committee’s deliberations or discussions.

7. The Dean shall first notify the department director of the Committee’s recommendation 
   and then submit the written report to the candidate and the department director.

8. Any requests for clarification or information by the candidate or the department director 
   related to the written report shall be made directly to the Dean.

9. The Dean shall forward the recommendation of the committee to the Provost with the 
   Dean’s endorsement or lack of endorsement of thereof.

10. If the recommendation of the Committee is negative and the recommendation is 
    appealed, the Dean will withhold endorsement to the Provost until the appeal is 
    completed.

11. If the positive recommendation of the committee is endorsed at all levels, the Dean shall 
    work with the Provost and Chancellor to prepare Regental Communication.

H. Appeal of Tenure and/or Promotion Committee Recommendation.

Appeal of Committee’s Recommendation

1. A faculty member may appeal the recommendation of the committee within five (5) 
   working days of receipt of the written report from the Dean. The appeal with supportive 
   evidence, made to the Dean, must specify one of the following conditions: 
   a. The decision is in violation of established University Policies and Procedures. 
   b. A significant omission in the process has occurred. 
   c. The decision is clearly prejudicial, inequitable, or unreasonable.

2. The Dean will appoint an Appeal Committee in consultation with the SHPS 
   Management Team. The Director of the candidate’s department cannot serve on the 
   appeal committee. When there is not an adequate number of tenured senior faculty 
   members in SHPS, the Dean may identify tenured senior faculty outside of SHPS to serve 
   on the Appeal Committee.
3. The Appeal Committee will determine the nature of the appeal and assess the adequacy of the evidence based on one or more of the conditions (a-c) for the appeal.

4. The Appeal Committee will report one of the following findings to the Dean:
   a) There is an absence of substantive evidence for the appeal.
   b) There is substantive evidence for the appeal.

5. In the case of substantive evidence, the appeal will commence.

6. Based on its deliberations, the Appeal Committee will send one of the following recommendations to the Dean:
   a) Endorse the recommendation of the Tenure and/or Promotion Committee
   b) Reverse the recommendation of the Tenure and/or Promotion Committee

7. The Dean may meet with the Appeal Committee for clarification of findings.

8. The Dean will make one of the following determinations:
   a) accept the Appeal Committee recommendation.
   b) reject the Appeal Committee recommendation.

**Appeal of Dean’s Recommendation**

1. In the case that the Dean does not endorse the Tenure and/or Promotion Committee’s positive recommendation, the applicant must appeal the Dean’s decision within five (5) working days an appeal can be made to the Provost.

2. The Provost will make one of the following determinations:
   a) accept the Dean’s recommendation.
   b) reject the Dean’s recommendation.

**Appeal of Provost’s Recommendation**

In the case that the committee and the dean have recommended tenure and/or promotion and the recommendation has not been endorsed by the provost, the appeal can be made to the UM-Flint Faculty Grievance Committee which hears appeals arising from administrative actions external to academic units.

I. **Breach of Confidentiality**

Should a breach of confidentiality occur during the process of the committee’s deliberations, the committee will consult with the dean to determine appropriate action.

J. **Storage of Materials and Deliberations Reviewed by Committee**

Permanent records (curriculum vita, copies of letters from external reviewers and committee recommendation) of the candidate’s documents collected by the committee should be stored in the Dean’s office. Other copies of these materials should be destroyed by individual committee
members. The portfolio will be returned to the candidate following action by the Board of the Regents.

**NOTE:** In the rare event that an exception to the timeline is requested, the decision to grant the exception is at the discretion of the Dean.

**REFERENCES**


## School of Health Professions and Studies
### Timeline for Promotion and Tenure Review*

### Regular Sequence Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 30</th>
<th>September 1</th>
<th>October 1</th>
<th>December 15</th>
<th>February 10</th>
<th>February 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Director requests early tenure review from Dean</td>
<td>Department Director provides potential reviewer names to the Dean</td>
<td>Deadline for appointment of Promotion and Tenure review committee</td>
<td>Deadline for external reviewer’s comments</td>
<td>Recommendation of Promotion and Tenure committee to Dean</td>
<td>Transmittal of recommendation by Dean to Provost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Early Sequence Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September 1</th>
<th>September 15</th>
<th>October 1</th>
<th>December 15</th>
<th>February 10</th>
<th>February 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Director requests early tenure review from Dean</td>
<td>Provost and Department Director decide whether to conduct full tenure review</td>
<td>Deadline for appointment of Promotion and Tenure review committee</td>
<td>Deadline for external reviewer’s comments</td>
<td>Recommendation of Promotion and Tenure committee to Dean</td>
<td>Transmittal of recommendation by Dean to Provost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Conduct full review
- No full review
- Dean and Department Director discuss Promotion and Tenure review committee

*Subject to change in keeping with item E “Procedures for Promotion Review”
Appendix A- Draft Letter

Date

Name
Address
City, State Zip

Dear ________________:

It is the practice of the School of Health Professions and Studies at the University of Michigan-Flint to ask experts outside the University to comment on the creative and scholarly work of candidates for promotion and/or tenure. ____________ is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Thank you for your willingness to perform this independent assessment of ____________’s work. Your scholarly and professional judgments will play an important part in our overall evaluation of her application for promotion and tenure.

The University of Michigan-Flint, an urban campus of The University of Michigan, is primarily an undergraduate institution with selected graduate programs. The typical teaching load is 9-12 contact hours per week and strong emphasis is placed on teaching. As the University of Michigan-Flint has a Carnegie classification as a Masters II institution, candidates for promotion and tenure are not expected to present the volume of research and scholarship demanded by a major research institution. However, we expect that their work be of high quality and that it make a recognizable contribution to the field. Please take this into account in your evaluation of ____________’s work.

Enclosed are a copy of the portion of our criteria and procedures for promotion review, ____________’s complete vita, and a sample(s) of her professional work for you to evaluate. Based on the enclosed materials as well as other knowledge you may have of her work or professional accomplishments, we request your candid evaluation of her written and scholarly contributions. In particular, we would appreciate your comments on the following issues:

1. What are your impressions about the quality and scholarly impact of the writing(s)?

2. Which, if any, of the publication(s) do you consider to be outstanding?

3. How would you estimate ____________’s standing in relation to others in her peer group who are working in the same field?

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. We do not, as a general practice, provide candidates with access to their promotion files without a specific written request. In that event, we would protect your confidentiality by intermingling and reordering the paragraphs from the
entire set of external letters after first removing all names, institutional affiliations and other identifying information from them. Legal considerations have diminished our ability to assure even this degree of confidentiality in the event of an investigation of alleged discrimination by a federal or state agency or a lawsuit by an unsuccessful candidate. Under such circumstances, a candidate is likely to be able to obtain access to his/her own promotion files, as well as the files of other candidates, successful or unsuccessful. We can assure you that we will not release your letter unless required to do so by law or court order.

We request that you return your review to us by ___________. Please do not make a statement or recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure of the candidate, but do provide an assessment of the enclosed material. We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biographical sketch, including a brief description of your own areas of expertise in ____________ and current research interests. A brief description of your professional relationship with __________ is also needed.

We realize that your schedule is full and that this is a time-consuming task; however, we will be most grateful for your assistance. If there is something we can do to aid you, please contact me at ________, fax _________, or by e-mail at ____________.

Sincerely,

Chair, Promotion and Tenure Committee

cc: Promotion and Tenure Committee
Enclosures

Revision 5.16.08 of H 2 approved.