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COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES (CHS)

SECTION I- PROMOTION & TENURE OR PROMOTION

PURPOSES
The purposes of the CHS tenure and/or promotion guidelines are to:

1. Specify general expectations for tenure and/or promotion that reflect the diverse nature of College of Health Sciences programs; and
2. Promote consistency in the tenure and/or promotion review process for College of Health Sciences faculty.

Scope of Policy and Procedure
The College of Health Sciences Tenure and/or Promotion policy and procedure includes criteria and procedures for the following reviews:

Tenure track
- 2nd and 4th year reviews
- Tenure and promotion
- Tenure upon hire

Clinical track
- preliminary review
- Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor
- Promotion to Clinical Professor

Expectations of CHS Faculty
The bylaws of the Regents of the University of Michigan grant to the faculty extensive rights to participate in and to oversee the management of the university. In fulfilling these responsibilities, it is expected that faculty will:

1. Carry out the missions of the Department, School, and University;
2. Actively participate in faculty governance through attendance at and contributions to Department, School, and University faculty meetings, committee meetings, and commencement;
3. Promote an atmosphere that is civil, respectful, and sensitive to diversity in all interactions;
4. Act in a manner that reflects favorably upon the University and one’s profession; and
5. Adhere to UM, UM-Flint, School, and Departmental rules, regulations, and codes of conduct.

APPOINTMENTS
Faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor/Clinical Assistant Professor or above may be appointed to either tenure-track or clinical track respectively. Appointments must be consistent with Standard Practice Guide (SPG) 201.13 and 201.34-1.

In special searches and as an integral part of the search process, the CHS faculty may deem it appropriate to recommend tenure upon employment at the Associate Professor or Professor level. Such a consideration may occur, for example, when hiring a Director or Associate Director of a CHS department, senior rank faculty member, or a senior university administrator who would hold an academic appointment in a CHS department.

**Tenure-track/Tenure**

1-1 Employment as Assistant Professor

*Eligibility criteria:* Academic doctoral degrees or discipline specific terminal doctoral degree. CHS Departments may have further restrictions for appointment to tenure track depending on professional program requirements and accreditation standards. Under special circumstances, an individual holding a professional doctorate degree with a record of scholarship may be hired on the tenure-track.

1-2 Promotion Review for Associate Professor

*Eligibility criteria:*
1. Sixth year since appointment as assistant professor.
2. Early eligibility in fifth year are determined by Department Director and Dean based on a portfolio that demonstrates an exceptional level of performance well beyond the standard promotion portfolio.

1-3 Promotion Review for Professor

*Eligibility criteria:*
1. Sixth year since appointment as associate professor or anytime thereafter.
2. Early eligibility in fifth year are determined by Department Director and Dean based on a portfolio that demonstrates an exceptional level of performance well beyond the standard promotion portfolio.

1-4 Tenure Upon Hire as Associate Professor with Tenure

1. Academic doctoral degrees or discipline specific terminal doctoral degree.
2. Minimum of 5 years of combined experience in teaching and research at a four-year institution or comprehensive university.
3. Eligible for licensure/certification in Michigan, if required by the discipline.
4. Faculty may not be appointed to Associate Professor without tenure.
5. Must meet all tenure requirements.

1-5 Tenure Upon Hire as Professor with Tenure

1. Academic doctoral degrees or discipline specific terminal doctoral degree.
2. Minimum of 10 years of combined experience in teaching and research at a four-year institution or comprehensive university.
3. Prior appointment as an Associate Professor at a four-year institution or comprehensive university.
4. Eligible for licensure/certification in Michigan if required by the discipline.
5. Faculty may not be appointed to Professor without tenure.
6. Must meet all tenure requirements.

Clinical Track

2-1 Employment as Clinical Assistant Professor

Eligibility criteria.
1. Credential professional with either a terminal professional degree in their discipline or advanced academic degree
2. Faculty with specialized clinical expertise who are expected to maintain their clinical expertise while fulfilling their roles in teaching, scholarship, and service to the University, CHS, department, community, and to their professional discipline.
3. Eligible for licensure/certification in Michigan, if required by the discipline.
4. CHS Departments may have further restrictions for appointment to clinical track depending on professional program requirements and accreditation standards.

2-2 Promotion Review for Clinical Associate Professor

Eligibility criteria.
1. Sixth year since appointment within the associate clinical professor track, or upon request thereafter.
2. Early eligibility in fifth year are determined by Department Director and Dean based on a portfolio that demonstrates an exceptional level of performance well beyond the standard promotion portfolio.

2-3 Promotion Review for Clinical Professor

Eligibility criteria.
1. Six years since appointment to clinical associate professor, or upon request thereafter.
2. Early eligibility in fifth year are determined by Department Director and Dean based on a portfolio that demonstrates an exceptional level of performance well beyond the standard promotion portfolio.

2-4 Employment upon hire as Clinical Associate Professor

Eligibility criteria.
1. Credentialed professional with either a terminal professional degree in their discipline or advanced academic degree
2. Minimum of six years of teaching at a four-year institution or comprehensive university.
3. Minimum of six years of clinical or professional experience specific to the discipline.
4. Eligible for licensure/certification in Michigan as required by the discipline.
5. Must meet all promotional requirements for clinical associate professor.

2-5 Employment upon hire as Clinical Professor
1. Credentialed professional with either a terminal professional degree in their discipline or advanced academic degree
2. Minimum of six years prior experience as Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor, Associate Professor with tenure, or Professor with tenure.
3. Eligible for licensure/certification in Michigan as required by the discipline.
4. Must meet all promotional requirements for clinical professor.

**Track Reassignment: (Tenure Track to Clinical Track or Clinical Track to Tenure Track)**

While it is expected that the track of initial appointment remains unchanged, it is possible for Clinical Track and Tenure Track faculty to seek one transfer to the other track during their employment at UM-Flint, if they are qualified for the other track, and if there is an opening in the other track. The Department Director must recommend the transfer and the CHS Dean must approve it in consultation with the CHS Management Team and Provost. This transfer from one track to the other can only be made once. Track transfers are only allowed within the first three years of a full-time faculty appointment at the assistant professor level and must be initiated through a faculty member request to their Department Director. If a faculty member who has a professional doctoral degree demonstrates appropriate research productivity within the first three years on a Clinical track, this individual may request to switch to a tenure-track.

Tenure track faculty who switch to clinical track may combine time in each track to meet promotion timelines in the clinical track. Clinical track faculty who switch to tenure track may request a tenure review timeline from 3-6 years to the Dean. The Dean will make a determination on the tenure clock in consultation with the Department Director in this case.

The Clinical Track is not used for candidates who clearly meet the requirements for a tenured or tenure track appointment. The Clinical Track does not carry the university rights of tenure as is defined for tenured faculty. For the clinical track, the initial term of employment will be for up to three years. Reappointments will vary from three to seven years, depending upon rank. Reappointment will be based on the performance of the faculty member and instructional and program needs.

**FACULTY EXPECTATIONS AND PORTFOLIO**

**Expectations in Teaching, Scholarship and Service**

This document describes activities appropriate for College of Health Sciences faculty in each of the major areas of performance. Taken together these activities provide a measure of faculty members’ contributions to the mission of the university, school, and department and a faculty member’s profession or discipline. Because of the nature of the professional programs in the College of Health Sciences, endeavors that enhance and broaden professional competency in all of the major areas are valued.

All faculty members are expected to write a one-page executive summary portfolio statement which addresses their development and philosophy/approach across the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as well as the integration of their teaching, scholarship and service when
applicable. The executive summary should also address how the candidate’s record furthers the mission of the School and University. Faculty members with administrative appointments should document the level of the administrative appointment and briefly discuss how it impacted areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

**All faculty members** are expected to demonstrate:
- Excellence in teaching expertise and teaching effectiveness
- Significant achievement in the area of service
- Continuous professional development in the major performance areas

**Tenure track/Tenure faculty members** are expected to demonstrate:
- Significant achievement in the area of scholarship

**Clinical track faculty members** are expected to demonstrate:
- Excellence in the area of clinical practice: Clinical practice is defined as delivery of direct patient care, supervision of client assessment and intervention, and/or clinical education administration.
- Moderate achievement in the area of scholarship.

**A. Teaching Expertise and Effectiveness**

*All CHS faculty* are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching in both teaching expertise and effectiveness categories, and a recognizable commitment to the success of students inside and outside the classroom.

Teaching settings include traditional classroom, laboratory, clinical, and online education as well as non-class related teaching activities.

Examples of teaching activities include:

On and off campus and/or online
- Lecturing in classrooms
- Instruction in laboratory courses
- Supervising student scholarly activities
- Serving on capstone, theses and dissertation committees
- Supervising independent studies
- Supervising 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
- Acting in an advisory capacity to the off-campus clinical educator
- Advising and mentoring of students
- Supporting student organizations

The **PORTFOLIO** must include:

**Section on Teaching**
1. Narrative statement, limited to two-pages, addressing the faculty member’s teaching philosophy, how the faculty member has developed as an instructor, and how his/her teaching supports the university’s mission. As part of the narrative, specify the following:
   a. What teaching strategies were used?
   b. Were teaching strategies effective in helping students to learn?
   c. In what way(s) did the instruction facilitate critical thinking for students?
   d. An explanation of how professional development that targeted teaching was used to improve courses and/or other teaching.
   e. Reflections on development since 2nd and 4th year reviews with attention to the recommendations made by prior review committees.

2. List of Instructional contributions – undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate courses, independent studies, supervision of student projects/research, and continuing education courses that are part of the candidate’s teaching load.

3. Syllabi for each course taught. If the course is taught multiple semesters, include both early and later syllabi (not all need to be included).

4. Examples of teaching and examination materials including papers or tests with feedback provided to students

5. All course student evaluations in the required CHS table format (Please see CHS staff for process in gathering & presenting this information)

6. A brief (1 paragraph) narrative of how each course was improved over the years reflecting on input from various sources including student feedback (do not have to include documentation from each time you taught a specific course).

7. Professional development that targeted teaching.

It is strongly suggested that the portfolio also include Peer Review Summaries of teaching and how the peer review summary was used to improve teaching strategies. Reviews can be completed by peers, teaching centers, laboratory instructors, or other appropriate colleagues.

Evidence Required for Teaching Expertise and Effectiveness
Teaching expertise must be demonstrated by all faculty members; evidence may include:
1. Evidence of and reasoning for recent attendance at workshops, conferences, symposiums, and/or continuing education (professional development) related to your areas of teaching expertise.
2. Inclusion of information in the narrative as to how your scholarship has enhanced your teaching expertise.
3. Student course evaluations on teaching expertise obtained through departmentally approved methods are required for every course section taught. If no course evaluations were submitted for a course, indicate this in the materials submitted.
4. Peer review of teaching focused on content of instruction and faculty expertise.
5. Graduate studies in content areas of teaching.
6. Academic advising contributions.
7. Course development.
9. Participation in inter-professional (across professions/departments) and interdisciplinary (within profession/department) teaching.
10. Provision of continuing education, workshops, or peer-reviewed presentations in area of teaching.
11. Feedback from continuing education workshops or conferences from participants focused on content of instruction.
12. Professional license in programs where required.
13. Other certification in content area of teaching.

Teaching **effectiveness** must be demonstrated by all faculty members.

A determination of teaching **effectiveness** is based on multiple sources of data collected over the review period including: Demonstration of effective presentation style; course design, planning and evaluation; adoption of meaningful assessment; and student advising. Evidence may include:

1. Student course evaluations on teaching effectiveness obtained through
   a. department-approved methods are essential for every course section taught.
   2. Peer review of teaching focused on teaching effectiveness. Peer evaluation of teaching may include direct observations, review of a Blackboard shell, and review of course syllabi and/or instructional materials.
   3. Feedback from workshop participants focused on teaching effectiveness.
   4. Feedback from recent alumni focused on teaching effectiveness.
   5. Commendation letters from students focused on teaching effectiveness.
   6. Peer reviewed publications in area of teaching.
   7. Teaching awards.
   8. Documentation of effective:
      a. Contributions related to curriculum and/or course/lab development and outcome assessment. Evidence of curriculum outcomes may include: feedback on curriculum in teaching area from student exit interviews and/or surveys; alumni and employer survey feedback on curriculum in teaching area.
      b. Experiential/service learning opportunities for students.
      c. Supervising and mentoring of co-curricular activities and/or theses, capstone projects, and/or dissertations (on and off campus).
      d. Ongoing self-assessment and improvement in teaching. Submission of a short narrative explaining how the instructor improved teaching of the course over time based on student feedback and self-reflection is advised.
      e. Student advising sessions (individual or group).
      f. Attendance at workshops, conferences, symposiums, and/or continuing education (professional development) related to your areas of teaching effectiveness.

**B. Scholarship (Research)**

**Tenure track faculty** members are expected to accomplish significant achievement in scholarship. Candidates for promotion are evaluated on the quantity, quality, and impact (taken together) of their scholarly activities/professional development. Work is expected to make a
contribution to and an impact on the profession/field/discipline, to interdisciplinary areas, and/or to pedagogical endeavors. Impact, for example, may be determined by peer reviewed journal impact factors, quartiles, number of citations; external reviewer opinions; and peer reviewed and/or invited presentations in local, state, national, and international venues. Although prior work will be considered, the primary focus of the reviews will be on the record of scholarly or creative activity while employed as a faculty member at UM-Flint, or expanded upon since promotion at UM-Flint. Candidates at all levels must also demonstrate promise of future productivity. The Committee review is complemented by documentation from external reviewers. For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, faculty are expected to have national/international dissemination of their scholarly papers and presentations. For promotion to Professor, faculty are expected to have a national and/or international reputation based on their scholarship.

**Clinical track faculty** are expected to accomplish at least moderate achievement in scholarship. Candidates for promotion are evaluated on the impact, quality, and 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. 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 at all levels must also demonstrate promise of future productivity. The Committee review is complemented by documentation from external reviewers. For promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, clinical faculty are expected to have regional contribution and reputation. For Promotion to Clinical Professor, clinical faculty are expected to have national contributions and reputation.

Scholarship is broadly defined using Ernest Boyer’s concept of scholarship for the professoriate (1996:1997). Scholarship includes those activities that advance teaching, research, practice, or service through rigorous inquiry that is significant to the field, is creative, documented, peer-reviewed, and publically disseminated. Peer-reviewed publications are required because they undergo a structured reviewing process in which reviewers with expertise on the topic, excluding in-house editors, evaluate the document to determine whether to accept or reject it for presentation or publication. The following definition of “peer reviewed journal” from the American Library Association Glossary of Library and Information Science will be used to establish whether a publication is considered peer reviewed. “A refereed journal has a structured reviewing system in which reviewers, excluding in-house editors, evaluate each unsolicited manuscript and advise the editor as to acceptance or rejection.” Non-peer reviewed publications, such as books, book chapters, and articles, may be considered. Publications in predatory journals

---

(journals that claim to be peer-reviewed but accept the overwhelming majority or all submissions) are not acceptable.

The descriptions of scholarship noted below are derived from Boyer’s work (1996:1997).

1. The scholarship of teaching includes not only transmitting knowledge, but also transforming and extending it. Scholarship of teaching produces knowledge to support the transfer of information from teacher to student. It is not merely 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.

2. The scholarship of discovery refers to the pursuit of inquiry and investigation in search of new knowledge. Scholarship of discovery represents the traditional view of research, including primary empirical research, historical research, theory development and testing, methodological studies, and philosophical inquiry and analysis.

3. The scholarship of integration consists of making connections across disciplines and advancing knowledge through synthesis. 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.

4. The scholarship of application asks how knowledge can be applied to the social issues of the times in a dynamic process that generates and tests new theory and knowledge. 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.

5. The scholarship of engagement connects any of the above dimensions of scholarship to the understanding and solving of pressing social, civic, and ethical problems. Scholarship of engagement (community-engaged scholarship) applies an integrative approach to the traditional domains of research, teaching, practice and service. Community-engaged scholarship is conducted with the community rather than on behalf of the community.

The PORTFOLIO must include:

Section on Scholarship
A narrative statement, limited to two pages, addressing the faculty member’s research area(s) or agenda(s) of focus and significance in the field and rationale, evidence for progress in the focus
areas (past, current, and future), and professional development related to scholarship. Include reflections on development since the last major review (consider 2- and/or 4-year review committee suggestions).

**Evidence for Scholarship/Research for Tenure Track**

Evidence of the scholarship of discovery, application, integration, and engagement may vary dependent on the focus of scholarship. Evidence of leadership in scholarly products should be documented.

Evidence for scholarship may include:

- Publications in peer reviewed\(^4\) national or international journals (may reflect any of the 5 forms of scholarship as defined by Boyer). Peer reviewed publications are required and weighted most highly.
  - Evidence of leadership (e.g. first authorship or corresponding author is weighted most highly). Clearly describe your contribution for each publication. The examples include research design, data collection, data analysis, and/or writing the manuscript.
  - Include impact factor of the journal at time of publication, if available, and other statistics/information to demonstrate the impact of the journal in the particular field.
- Scholarly grant activity (if available)
  - Funded intramural grant proposals such as department, school, university (any UM campus)
  - Funded (or approved) extramural grant proposals such as federal, state, city, foundation and industry-sponsored agencies
  - Submitted, but not funded, proposals
- Invited or peer reviewed research presentations
  - Specify if local, state, regional, national, or international
- Published, non-peer reviewed publications such as research, position or policy papers
- Full-length, peer-reviewed conference proceedings
- Published monographs, compendiums, books, or chapters in books
- Invited workshop presentations related to evidence-based practice and areas of scholarship
- Patents or licensed copyrights.
- Applied research, e.g. agency reports

**Evidence Required for Professional Development Related to Scholarship Consistent with Narrative Statement of Goals**

- Evidence of and reasoning for recent attendance at workshops, conferences, symposiums, and/or continuing education (professional development) related to areas of scholarship expertise.

---

\(^4\) The following definition of “peer reviewed journal” from the American Library Association Glossary of Library and Information Science will be used to establish whether a publication is considered peer reviewed.

“A refereed journal has a structured reviewing system in which reviewers, excluding in-house editors, evaluate each unsolicited manuscript and advise the editor as to acceptance or rejection.”
• A reflection of how the professional development that targeted scholarship was used to enhance research conceptualization and skills

**Evidence for Scholarship/Research for Clinical Track**

• Publications in peer reviewed national or international journals (may reflect any of the 5 forms of scholarship as defined by Boyer) and in their area of clinical expertise.
  o Evidence of contributing (e.g. first authorship, second author or corresponding author. Clearly describe your contribution for each publication).
  o Include impact factor of the journal at time of publication, if available, and other statistics/information to demonstrate the impact of the journal in the particular field.

• Scholarly grant activity to include funding source, PI, amount, timeframe, and percent effort (if available)
  o Funded intramural grant proposals such as department, school, university (any UM campus)
  o Funded extramural grant proposals
  o Submitted, but not funded, proposals

• Invited or peer reviewed presentations
  o Specify if local, state, regional, national, or international

• Published, non-peer reviewed publications such as case reports, clinical studies

• Participation in national guidelines/setting of standards

• Creation and dissemination of innovative approaches to clinical care

• Participation in collaborative research

• Full-length, peer-reviewed conference proceedings

• Published monographs, compendiums, books, or chapters in books

• Invited workshop presentations related to evidence-based practice and areas of clinical expertise

**C. Service to the University, Profession, and Community**

_all CHS’s faculty members_ are expected to provide service to the university, college department, profession, and the community. Consistent with the mission of CHS and the University, 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.

The PORTFOLIO must include:

The service narrative, limited to two pages, should include summaries of and rationale for professional, community, university, CHS, and departmental service.

Integration/interconnections of service at different levels (i.e. professional, community, university, CHS, and departmental) should be discussed. The service narrative should end with future goals in the area of service. Include reflections on development since the last major review (consider 2- and 4-year review committee suggestions).
Evidence for tenure and clinical track faculty may include, but is not limited to (specify role/contributions of service in each area):

1. Service to the department, school or university may include:
   a. Participation on committees, ad hoc committees, and/or task forces.
   b. Involvement in recruitment, accreditation, admissions, recruitment or other department, school or university projects or initiatives.
   c. Education and/or mentorship of faculty

2. Service to the community may include:
   a. Professional consultation
   b. Serving in appointed or elected positions in community groups related to health care
   c. Providing professional in-service training and workshops
   d. Representing the profession or university before a variety of community groups
   e. Community service not related to UM-Flint faculty position.
      i. Volunteer clinical practice
      ii. Community committees, groups, and services

3. Service to the profession may include professional association activities such as:
   a. Holding office
   b. Participating on task forces and committees
   c. Participation in accrediting body activities and reviews of other programs
   d. Writing items for registry, licensure, or certification exams.
   e. Manuscript reviews for refereed journals, conference abstract reviews, book reviews, consultation reports

Evidence for Professional Development Related to Service Consistent with Narrative Statement of Goals

1. Evidence of and reasoning for recent attendance at workshops, conferences, symposiums, and/or continuing education (professional development) related to areas of service
2. A reflection of how the professional development that targeted service was used to enhance service skills.

D. Clinical Practice, if applicable.
Excellence in clinical practice is an expectation of all clinical faculty. Maintenance of this excellence requires time and commitment. A narrative statement, limited to two pages, by the applicant should be included to discuss their philosophy on clinical excellence and how the faculty member feels he/she has maintained this quality in their field. The following may be addressed in the narrative statement and documented with evidence.

- Outstanding clinical work in field
- Consistency for meeting institutional standards for professionalism
- Invitation to participate in educational/clinical courses based on their field
- Patient acknowledgement
- Mentorship of junior clinicians
- Administration of clinical education programs
• Sought out for clinical knowledge by colleagues inside and outside of institution
• Consultations
• Peer acknowledgement (support letters may be added separately)

E. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor Criteria.

Promotion to the rank of Professor is made according to the same three criteria that guide promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, specifically teaching, scholarship, and service. For promotion to Professor, expectations for achievements in these three areas are higher than for promotion to Associate Professor and with an expectation of greater impact.

1. Teaching
   • Course development
   • Course re-design
   • Course instruction
   • Mentoring in students and junior faculty.
   • Review curriculum and modify as needed
   • Participate in the peer review evaluation (to assess professional contents or pedagogy)

2. Scholarship
   • Established himself/herself as a scholar at the national and/or international level.
   • Mentoring in students and junior faculty

3. Service
   • Leadership roles and activities in service are expected.
   • Participate in high-impact university committees.
   • Participate in accreditation planning and review processes in the department, school, and/or university.

4. Clinical Excellence, if applicable.
   • Outstanding clinical work is expected
   • Mentoring of clinicians and students in clinical practice

PROCESSES & PROCEDURES

Appointment Periods

A. Tenure Track: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor
   1. Assistant Professor: Initial appointments will be for 3 years. Following the 2nd year review, reappointment will be for 0-3 years. Faculty who fail to achieve tenure in their sixth year review are offered a one-year terminal contract. No faculty member shall remain in a tenure-track position for more than eight years on the Flint campus. (Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Tenure-Track Faculty at The University of Michigan-Flint, Revised April 2014).

B. Clinical Track: Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Professor
   1. Clinical Assistant Professor: Initial appointments will be for 3 years. Following the three year review, reappointment will be made for 0-3 years.
2. Promoted Clinical Associate Professor: 5 year term-limited appointment period.
3. Promoted Clinical Professor: 7 year term-limited appointment period.

**Time Periods for Tenure and/or Promotion**

**A. Tenure and Clinical Track**

A-1 Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure or Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor

- 2nd year review is conducted in winter of year two for tenure track faculty candidates.
  - CHS Dean’s office organizes the 2nd year review.
- 4th year review is conducted in winter of year four (optional unless mandated by Department Director and/or Dean at 2 year review) for tenure and clinical track faculty candidates.
  - CHS Dean’s office organizes the 4th year review.
- A preliminary review must be conducted for clinical track faculty who plan to pursue a promotion at least two years prior to their promotion review.
- Tenure track faculty:
  - Tenure and promotion review is conducted in fall of year six for tenure track faculty. The request for promotion from tenure track Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is accompanied by a request for tenure. Exceptionally strong cases may be considered in year 5 upon recommendation from the Department Director.
  - Those tenure track faculty who are denied tenure will be offered a one year non-renewable contract as an assistant professor without tenure for the subsequent academic year.
  - Following consideration of the tenure and promotion portfolio, and with input from the review committee (received by the Dean no later than October 4), the Dean may make a determination to defer and conduct a review in the fall of year seven. The decision to defer the full review to year seven must be communicated by the Dean to the faculty candidate in writing no later than December 15 of year six.
- Clinical track faculty:
  - Clinical Assistant Professors are eligible to seek promotion to Clinical Associate Professor in sixth year since appointment as Clinical Assistant Professor or later. With Director’s and Dean’s support, exceptionally strong cases may be considered in year 5.
  - Those clinical track faculty members who are not supported for promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor may request a subsequent review the following year or any year thereafter.
- Review is conducted in the fall semester with external reviewers contacted the previous spring semester.

A-2 Associate Professor with Tenure to Professor with Tenure and Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor
Associate Professors and Clinical Associate Professors are eligible to seek promotion to Professor and Clinical Professor in sixth year since appointment as Associate Professor within the tenure track or Clinical Associate Professor. With Director’s and Dean’s support, exceptionally strong cases may be considered in year 5.  
- Review is conducted in the fall semester with external reviewers contacted the previous spring semester

SECTION II – TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

Years Designated for Review Material Inclusion
Faculty in the tenure and clinical tracks must provide detailed documentation of their past six years in all areas and may present documentation from earlier years as they deem appropriate to their review.

Tenure and Promotion Review Timeline
This timeline may change slightly as a result of changes in deadlines determined by the Provost. In the rare event that an exception to the timeline is requested, the decision to grant the request is at the discretion of the Dean and/or Provost.

EXAMPLE CHS TIME LINE FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS 2017-2018

1. By February 1st of the 4th year: A request from a faculty member for early promotion is made by the faculty member to the Department Director by this date. The Director will discuss the request with the Dean and the Dean will discuss the request with the Provost. The Dean will inform the faculty member and the Department Director whether an early review is warranted no later than March 1st.

2. By April 1st of the 5th year- A request for tenure and/or promotion review for faculty members is made by the Department Director to the Dean. This request shall be accompanied by the current vitae of the faculty member and a one page summary of his/her accomplishments in all areas of promotion review. Recommendations to the Dean regarding review committee membership may be made at the same time by both the faculty candidate and the Department Director.

3. By May 1st – The Dean appoints the members of the Review Committee.

4. By May 1st – Faculty candidate, in consultation with the Director, provides list of ten potential external reviewer names to the Associate Dean/Dean with brief descriptions of the reviewer and contact information using the Potential External Reviewer table. Clinical track faculty must submit a list of three clinician experts who can provide a reference regarding their clinical expertise in addition to ten potential external reviewers who can review their scholarship.

5. By May 1st – Department Director provides list of five potential external reviewer names to the Associate Dean/Dean with brief descriptions of the reviewer and contact information using the Potential External Reviewer table.
6. **By May 1**<sup>st</sup> – Faculty candidate submits updated CV, scholarship narrative, and all submitted or published manuscripts on Blackboard or Sedona. Clinical Track faculty must also submit their clinical expertise narrative. Faculty candidate also submits external reviewer tables found in the Promotion and Tenure Guideline appendices. Alternatively, these materials may be submitted on a thumb drive to the Dean’s Office.

7. **By May 31**<sup>st</sup> – Review committees submit prioritized list of selected potential reviewers to the Associate Dean/Dean.

8. **By June 30**<sup>th</sup> - Dean’s Office will send out all requests for review to reviewers.

9. **By August 31**<sup>st</sup> – The Dean submits to the Provost a list of confirmed external reviewers for each candidate, with brief description of their credentials.

10. **By September 1**<sup>st</sup> - Faculty candidate makes fully completed portfolio with an updated CV available to review committee members, Department Director, Associate Dean, Dean, Provost, Executive Secretary to the Provost and administrative assistants in the Dean’s Office. Dean’s Office provides external reviews to review committee.

11. **By September 6**<sup>th</sup> - The Dean submits to the Provost:
   a. the names of confirmed external reviewers and their credentials
   b. updated CVs

12. **By September 15**<sup>th</sup> – Department Director may submit a letter of no more than three pages stating his/her recommendation of support or non-support for tenure and/or promotion to the Dean and review committee chair.

13. **By October 4**<sup>th</sup> – The Review Committee Chair submits the teaching section recommendation to the Dean.

14. **By October 10**<sup>th</sup> – The Dean submits documentation of teaching effectiveness to the Provost.

15. **By October 27**<sup>th</sup> – The Review Committee Chair submits the final review recommendation to the Dean.

16. **By November 3**<sup>rd</sup> – The Dean submits to the Provost an updated CV, documentation of research, and the Review Committee Recommendation.

17. **By November 3**<sup>rd</sup> – The Deans forwards the Review Committee recommendation to the Department Director and the Candidate.

18. **Within 10 working days of receiving the Review Committee recommendation** – If the candidate wishes to submit a rebuttal to the committee recommendation, the rebuttal letter with supportive evidence must be submitted to the Dean.
19. **By December 7th** – The Dean submits to the Provost documentation of service.

20. **By January 3rd** - The Dean submits to the Provost the Summary Letter from the Dean and the Regents Communication as needed.

**Promotion Review Committee Composition and Function**

1. **Appointment to Review Committee**
   - After consultation with the candidate and candidate’s Director, and further consultation with CHS management team, the Review Committee Chair and Committee are appointed by the Dean.
   - The Dean informs the candidate of the committee membership.
   - If the candidate has any concerns regarding the Review Committee members, he/she must inform the Dean of this concern within 5 working days of being informed of the Review Committee membership. The Dean will then evaluate the concern. If the concern is significant, the Dean will replace the Review Committee member with another faculty member.

2. **Composition** - CHS tenure track faculty with one rank above may serve on tenure and promotion review committees. Committees must be chaired by one of CHS faculty members.

   Tenure Track Review Committee: Minimum of 5 tenured faculty members with at least 3 members must be from CHS (1-2 of the 3 CHS faculty should be from the candidate’s department when possible). For promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, all members shall hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, the majority of the committee members shall hold the rank of Professor.*

*If there are insufficient numbers of eligible CHS faculty available to serve, similar (tenured or clinical) faculty from a similar discipline/field within UM-Flint will be appointed. Retired and emeriti from the professorial ranks are excluded from serving on review committees. If necessary, a person from an outside institution with like size (same Carnegie classification, i.e. Master’s Large) and mission could be selected. This person must follow the tenure and promotion standards for CHS for the purpose of this review.

Composition - CHS faculty with one rank above may serve on tenure and promotion review committees. Committees must be chaired by one of CHS faculty members.

Tenure Track Review Committee: Minimum of 5 tenured faculty members with at least 3 members must be from CHS (1-2 of the 3 CHS faculty should be from the candidate’s department when possible). For promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, all members shall hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, the majority of the committee members shall hold the rank of Professor.*
Clinical Track Review Committee: Minimum of 3 faculty members with at least 2 members must be from CHS (1-2 of the 3 faculty should be from the candidate’s department when possible). Whenever possible, two members must be clinical track and one member must be tenure track. Whenever possible, at least one member of the Promotion Review Committee shall be a Clinical Track faculty member from the department of the person being reviewed. If there is no other Clinical Track faculty member within that department, another Clinical Track faculty member in CHS could be appointed or a Clinical Track faculty member external to CHS or the UM-Flint may also be recommended for consideration for appointment by the department Director. For promotion from Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate Professor, all members shall hold the rank of Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor or Associate Professor or Professor. For promotion from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor, the majority of the committee members shall hold the rank of Clinical Professor or Professor.*

*If there are insufficient numbers of eligible CHS faculty available to serve, similar (tenured or clinical) faculty from a similar discipline/field within UM-Flint will be appointed. Retired and emeriti from the professorial ranks are excluded from serving on review committees. If necessary, a person from an outside institution with like size (same Carnegie classification, i.e. Master’s Large) and mission could be selected. This person must follow the tenure and promotion standards for CHS for the purpose of this review.

3. Chair - The Dean appoints a CHS faculty member from the candidate’s department whenever possible as Chair and, after an initial meeting with the committee, will communicate only with the Chair on matters pertaining to the committee process. Communication with the candidate must proceed directly through the Dean.

Chair duties:
   a. Orient all members to the details of the CHS Criteria and Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion Review document and inform the committee that all discussions, materials reviewed, and deliberations must be held in strictest confidence.
   b. Maintain strict timelines set for the committee.
   c. Validate the qualifications of the external reviewers
   d. Finalized and submit prioritized listing of external reviewers with determination of arm’s length status to the Dean (see external reviewer tables)
   e. Chair compiles sections of recommendation letter into one coherent report written with one writing style to submit to Dean electronically and in hard copy with all committee member signatures.

The Review Committee letter not exceed four pages inclusive of the signature page and must include:
   1. Review process – one paragraph.
      a. Information on candidate’s educational degrees
      b. Date of appointment and appointment type
c. Statement on review process

2. Teaching – no more than one page.
   a. Teaching philosophy – is it coherent and consistent with CHS mission?
   b. Teaching expertise
      i. Analysis of evidence to support or refute this
   c. Teaching effectiveness
      i. Analysis of evidence to support or refute this
   d. Potential for future teaching contributions
   e. Committee vote on teaching section

3. Scholarship – no more than one page.
   a. Is there a clear line of research (or more than one)?
   b. Is the faculty member establishing a reputation as a scholar? At what level?
   c. Information about number of publications (grants too if achieved)
   d. Information from external reviewers
   e. Statement on quality/impact and quantity of scholarship
   f. Potential for future scholarly contributions
   g. Committee vote on scholarship section

4. Service – no more than one page (preferably less)
   a. University service (inclusive of department, school, and university)
   b. Professional service
   c. Community service
   d. Potential for future service contributions
   e. Committee vote on service section

5. Practice – no more than one page if applicable (preferably less)
   a. Specialization of candidate?
   b. Is the candidate an expert clinician?
   c. Potential for continued clinical excellence?
   d. Committee vote on practice section

6. Recommendation to Dean – one paragraph
   a. Has the candidate met and/or exceeded expectations for tenure and/or promotion?
   b. Does the committee recommend tenure and/or promotion?
   c. Include committee vote on recommendation

4. Duties of Review Committee members –
   • All members will be present in person or electronically for all Review Committee meetings.
   • **All members** of the committee will review each area (teaching, research, service, and practice if included) of the electronic portfolio prepared and submitted by the candidate.
   • Each committee member will submit to the Review Committee Chair 3-5 bullet points on the strengths and 3-5 bullet points on the weaknesses, as appropriate, of each of the sections of the review (teaching, scholarship, service, and practice if included).
• Using input from all committee members, committee members write the summaries of sections for the Review Committee Chair’s use in completing the committee recommendation letter and meet as needed to complete the committee work.

• All committee members must approve the final recommendation letter and sign the cover letter for the final recommendation letter that is submitted to the Dean.
  o If a committee member refuses to sign the final recommendation, he/she must submit to the Dean a one-page minority report recommendation.

• Validate the qualifications of the external reviewers

5. External Reviewers
   a. Identification: The candidate will provide a list of names, academic rank, tenure status (if known), addresses, Carnegie classification, telephone numbers, email addresses, and web links of at least 10 possible external reviewers and the Department Director will submit at least 5 additional possible external reviewers with the same information (see external review tables) 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 Department Director will see the list that the faculty member provides so that there is not duplication between the two lists. The candidate can view the director’s reviewer list. However, it is not appropriate for the candidate to be involved in the creation of the director’s reviewer list.

1. CHS recommends that the reviewer list include faculty from institutions of similar Carnegie classification and mission.

2. In addition, the candidate will provide a table which includes an ordered list of the candidate’s publications (most recent at the top), title of publication & the year published, authors (candidate’s name bolded, student(s) names underlined), the journal name (link preferred), and full citation of the journal article or book. In the last column, please indicate the recommended external reviewers last names in the preferred order of selection for each journal article (see External review tables)

3. The lists are submitted to the Dean according to the Timeline. The Dean typically sends three scholarly products to each external reviewer.

b. Selection - External reviewers are professionals in the disciplines or fields who possess the expertise to review the candidate’s work. External reviewers should be at arm’s length and, whenever possible, should come from an institution with a similar mission and Carnegie classification. External reviewers should represent a variety of perspectives.

1. Arm’s Length – Relationships with reviewers of scholarly products should be at least at “arm’s length” with the faculty candidate. The following people fail the arm’s length definition for reviewers: former teachers, advisors, mentors, current or former co-workers and co-authors or major research collaborators
2. The one exception to the arm’s length requirement for appropriate reviewers is for those clinical faculty candidates who may provide reviews of the candidate’s clinical expertise. In this case the reviewers may be someone who works directly with the candidate and should remain objective in their observations of the candidate.

3. It is the responsibility of the committee to determine the appropriateness of the reviewers provided by the candidate and department director.
   a. At least two of the five reviewers recommended by the department director must be used.
   b. Reviewers must have a current record of publication.
   c. Reviewers may not include retired or emeriti faculty.
   d. If an insufficient number of acceptable names are provided to the committee, the Dean will request a list of additional reviewers from both the candidate and Department Director. The committee will select at least twelve reviewers.

4. Designation of Review Assignments – The candidate will recommend which scholarly products will be sent to each external reviewer, the committee will review, edit as necessary, and submit this list to the Dean (see two external reviewer tables)
   c. Contacts – The Dean’s office will make initial contact with reviewers to ascertain willingness and ability to provide the service in the stated time frame.
   d. Letters - A letter from the Dean with the designated review materials and timeline will be sent to each external reviewer by the Dean’s staff. The letter from the Dean shall stipulate 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 or clinical practice as appropriate. (see examples of external letters)

6. Resources Associated with Review Committee Functions
   a. The candidate is responsible for assembling the electronic portfolio.
   b. For 2nd and 4th year evaluations and all promotion and/or tenure reviews, the Dean’s office will assume costs of committee work, e.g. clerical/administrative support, duplication of materials for external reviewers, communication with external reviewers, final report, and reimbursement for mileage when an outside committee member is used. Clerical/administrative support functions shall include:
      1. Assistance in locating university regulations regarding tenure and promotion reviews.
      2. Informing the committee of university deadlines related to the committee’s work.
      3. Assistance in scheduling meetings.
      4. Mailing (paper or electronic) letters and documents to external reviewers.
      5. Tracking responses to reviewer requests and scholarship reviews.
      6. Providing access to online portfolio to Provost’s Office.

7. Review Committee Recommendations and Report
a. The Chair of the Review Committee in conjunction with the committee members shall prepare a coherent written report addressing each of the three-four areas of performance including responses of selected external reviewers.

b. The committee will vote on each section of the review (teaching, scholarship, service, practice) to determine if the faculty candidate has met the review criteria for that section. The vote count for each section shall be included in the committee’s recommendation to the Dean.

c. The committee will recommend one of the following outcomes, each requiring a majority vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Clinical Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Grant tenure and promotion.</td>
<td>a) Grant promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Deny tenure and promotion.</td>
<td>b) Deny promotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. The Review Committee Chair shall convey the actual vote to the Dean with the committee’s recommendation and written report. The written report shall include a rationale for the decision and committee members’ signatures. The Chair should be available if the Dean requires any clarification of the report. The Dean shall have access to the candidate’s electronic portfolio, committee report, and external reviewer letters, but not the Review Committee’s deliberations or discussions.

e. The Dean shall meet with the Review Committee following receipt of the Committee’s recommendation to gain a full understanding of the rationale for the recommendation.

f. Following submission of the Review Committee recommendation to the Dean, all Review Committee documents and emails regarding the case shall be shredded or deleted. No committee members should retain any documentation from the faculty candidate’s tenure and/or promotion review process.

**Subsequent Actions**

The Dean shall forward to the Provost:

1. Summary letter from the Dean with a statement of support or non-support for promotion and tenure
2. Recommendation of the Review Committee
3. Vote of Review Committee
4. Curriculum Vitae of candidate (if updated since September)
5. Documentation of teaching effectiveness by both the Dean and the candidate
6. Regents Communication if the Dean supports promotion and/or tenure of the candidate

The Dean will provide to the Department Director and faculty candidate:

1. Recommendation letter of the Review Committee
2. Summary letter from the Dean with a statement of support or non-support for promotion and tenure

**SECTION III – SECOND AND FOURTH – YEAR AND PRELIMINARY REVIEWS**
• The second-year review is mandatory for Tenure Track.
• The fourth-year review is optional unless mandated by the Department Director and/or Dean.
• A preliminary review must be conducted for clinical track faculty who plan to pursue a promotion at least two years prior to their promotion review.

PURPOSES
Purpose of 2nd and 4th year reviews for tenure track and preliminary reviews for clinical track
1. 2nd Year/First Reappointment Reviews – The purpose is to provide interdepartmental (within CHS) faculty input with regard to a candidate’s suitability for reappointment; and for those candidates recommended for reappointment, guidance to strengthen achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service (including professional development) and clinical excellence (if appropriate) in preparation for a future promotion and/or tenure review.
2. Four Year/Second Reappointment Reviews – The purpose is to provide the candidate feedback regarding their preparation for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. The main focus of the review is on professional performance from the time of initial appointment to Assistant Professor through submission of the portfolio. Positive reappointment reviews are not a guarantee of future success in promotion.
3. Preliminary Reviews – The purpose is to provide the candidate feedback regarding their preparation for promotion from Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate Professor. The main focus of the review is on professional performance from the time of initial appointment to Assistant Professor through submission of the portfolio. Positive reappointment reviews are not a guarantee of future success in promotion.
4. Candidates must follow strict timelines for the review process as specified below.

Resources for Second and Fourth-Year and Preliminary Reviews
Resources Associated with the 2nd and 4th year and Preliminary Review Committee Functions
1. The candidate is responsible for assembling the electronic portfolio.
2. The portfolio development must follow the instructions for the Tenure and Promotion reviews.
3. The CHS Dean’s Office is responsible to provide:
   a. Organization of the 2nd and 4th year and preliminary reviews is conducted by the CHS Dean’s office.
   b. Information regarding the CHS 2nd and 4th year and preliminary review process
   c. Appointment of review committees with consultation from the Department Director and CHS Management Team.
   d. Meeting scheduling assistance for 2- and 4-year and Preliminary Review Committees.

2nd and 4th year and preliminary review process
1. 2nd and 4th year and Preliminary Review Committee Composition
   a. The faculty candidate may submit to the Department Director and Dean a list of possible committee members. Committee appointments are made by the Dean in consultation with the Department Director and CHS Management Team.
b. Committees must be chaired by a CHS faculty member, preferably from the candidate’s department and the same track (tenure or clinical).

c. Each committee shall have a minimum of three faculty:
   1. The preferred composition is to have all committee members of senior rank. If this is not possible, at least one member of the committee shall be of senior rank. All members should have already completed the 2nd year or 4th year review process.
   2. Whenever possible at least one member shall come from the faculty member’s department, and a minimum of one member should come from another department within CHS.
      a. If no member of higher rank is available within the department, a faculty member who has been reviewed by this process, and is beyond their initial contract period may serve as the designated departmental committee member.
   3. At least two members must be CHS faculty members.
   4. Members of the CHS Management Team may serve as committee members (not chairs) for candidates outside of their department if there are an insufficient number of senior faculty members to serve on committees.
   5. If necessary, one member may come from the discipline of the faculty member within the University of Michigan system.

2. Responsibilities of 2nd and 4th year and Preliminary Review Committee Members, Committee Chair, and Department Director
   a. Committee Member Responsibilities
      1. All members will be present in person or electronically for all Review Committee meetings.
      2. All members of the committee will review all contents of the electronic portfolio prepared and submitted by the candidate.
      3. Each committee member will submit to the Review Committee Chair 3-5 bullet points on the strengths and 3-5 bullet points on the weaknesses/opportunities for improvement, as appropriate, of each of the sections of the review (teaching, scholarship, service).
      4. Using input from all committee members, committee members write the summaries of sections for the Review Committee Chair’s use in completing the committee recommendation letter and meet as needed to complete the committee work.
      5. All committee members must approve the final recommendation letter and sign the cover letter for the final recommendation letter that is submitted to the Dean.
   b. Chair duties:
      1. Orient all members to the details of the CHS Criteria and Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion Review document and inform the committee that all discussions, materials reviewed, and deliberations must be held in strictest confidence.
      2. Maintain strict timelines set for the committee.
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3. Chair compiles sections of recommendation letter into one coherent report written with one writing style to submit to Dean electronically and in hard copy with all committee member signatures. The Review Committee letter must include:
   a. Teaching – no more than one page.
      1. Teaching philosophy – is it coherent and consistent with CHS mission?
      2. Teaching expertise
         a. Areas of strength
         b. Areas of needed improvement with specific suggestions
      3. Teaching effectiveness
         a. Areas of strength
         b. Areas of needed improvement with specific suggestions
      4. Potential for future teaching contributions
   b. Scholarship – no more than one page.
      1. Is there a clear line of research (or more than one)?
      2. Is the faculty member establishing a reputation as a scholar? At what level?
      3. Information about number of publications (grants too if achieved)
      4. Information from external reviewers
      5. Statement on quality/impact and quantity of scholarship
      6. Areas of strength
      7. Areas of needed improvement with specific suggestions
      8. Potential for future scholarly contributions
   c. Service – no more than one page (preferably less)
      1. University service (inclusive of department, school, and university)
      2. Professional service
      3. Community service
      4. Areas of strength
      5. Areas of needed improvement with specific suggestions
      6. Potential for future service contributions
   d. Practice – no more than one page if applicable (preferably less)
      1. Specialization of candidate?
      2. Is the candidate an expert clinician?
      3. Areas of strength
      4. Areas of needed improvement with specific suggestions
      5. Potential for continued clinical excellence?
   e. Recommendation to Department Director and Dean – one paragraph
      1. Does the committee recommend contract renewal?
   4. Include committee vote on recommendation
5. Total length of Review Committee letter must not exceed four pages inclusive of signature page.

6. Subsequent Actions
   a. Department Director shall deliver the completed committee review to the candidate and discuss the contents of the review along with any other recommendations with the faculty member under review.
   b. Department Director shall utilize information in the review to assist in determining reappointment status of the faculty candidate in the case of 2nd year reviews and advising of the faculty member relative to preparedness for tenure and/or promotion review following 2nd - and 4th year and preliminary reviews.

**Timelines**

**2nd Year Mandatory Review for Tenure Track**
- By the end of the second week of the Fall semester of the second year, the Dean informs the faculty candidate that a 2nd year review will be conducted.
- By the end of the second week of the Fall semester of the second year, if the candidate wishes, he/she may submit to the Department Director and Dean suggestions for names of faculty members to serve on the 2nd year committee.
- By October 30\(^{th}\) of the second year, Dean appoints the 2nd year review committee in consultation with the Department Director and CHS Management Team.
- **By March 15 in the second year**, the candidate makes the portfolio available to the committee members.
- All communication and requests for additional information from the faculty member under review must go through the Dean during the review process. The candidate may inform the Chair and Dean of updates to the portfolio (such as new publications) while the 2nd year review is being conducted.
- By May 10\(^{th}\), the Chair of the 2nd year review committee sends its review to the Dean. The Dean shares the reviews with Directors.
- By May 15\(^{th}\), the Department Director shares results of review with the faculty member and provides the faculty member with a copy of the complete committee review.

**4th Year Optional Review for Tenure Track and Preliminary Review for Clinical Track**
- By the end of the second week of the Fall semester of the fourth year, the faculty members notifies the Dean of request for a 4th year review or preliminary review.
- By the end of the second week of the Fall semester of the fourth year, if the candidate wishes, he/she may submit suggestions for names of faculty members to serve on the 4th year review committee.
- By October 30\(^{th}\), Dean appoints the 4th year or preliminary review committee in consultation with the Department Director and CHS Management Team.
- **By March 15 of the fourth year**, the candidate makes the portfolio available to the committee members.
• All communication and requests for additional information from the faculty member under review must go through the Dean during the review process. The candidate may inform the Chair and Dean of updates to the portfolio (such as new publications) while the 4th year review is being conducted.
• By May 10th, the Chair of the 4th year or preliminary review committee sends its review to the Dean. The Dean shares the reviews with Directors.
• By May 15th, the Department Director shares results of review with the faculty member and provides the faculty member with a copy of the complete committee review.

**Electronic portfolio for Second and Fourth-Year Reviews**
The criteria are the same as listed in Section I: Tenure and/or Promotion: Expectations in Teaching, Scholarship and Service. Faculty members are responsible for creating and submitting an electronic portfolio to the Review Committee according to the timeline above.

**SECTION IV- TENURE UPON HIRE (Tenure Track only)**

A. Purpose - In special searches and as an integral part of the search process, the CHS faculty may deem it appropriate to recommend tenure upon hire for a candidate at the associate professor or professor level. Such a consideration may occur, for example, when hiring a director, associate director, or associate professor/professors of a CHS department or when hiring a senior university administrator who would hold an academic appointment in a CHS department. See other sections of this document for more complete descriptions of criteria for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor.

B. Criteria - A faculty member may be recommended for tenure upon hire only if sufficient documentation is obtained to support a recommendation for tenure consistent with established CHS promotion and tenure review criteria. For a candidate who has been granted promotion/tenure at another institution, the portfolio may be requested and serve as the basis for review. Additional documents may be requested for review consistent with position responsibilities. Minimum documentation required includes:

1. Updated curriculum vitae
2. Teaching
   a. Narrative philosophical statement
   b. Most recent year’s teaching evaluations, if available. If not available, alternative evidence may include, but is not limited to:
      i. Past teaching evaluations
      ii. Annual evaluations that address teaching expertise and effectiveness
      iii. Evaluations by attendees of teaching or/and clinical education presentations
   c. Documentation of teaching awards if available.
3. Scholarship
   a. Narrative statement addressing the faculty member’s research area(s) of focus, significance in the field, rationale, evidence for progress in the focus areas (past, current, and future), and professional development related to scholarship.
b. Copies of all publications (pdf preferred). Include impact factor of the journal at time of publication if available and other statistics/information to demonstrate the impact of the journal in the particular field.

4. Service
   a. Narrative statement regarding how service has made a contribution to the profession, and/or communities, schools/universities.
   b. Copies of service awards

5. All transcripts verifying degrees

6. Proof of current licensure or certifications, if appropriate

7. Three written references which address teaching, scholarship, and service.

8. Additional information as the Review Committee Chair, in consultation with committee, and/or Dean deem appropriate.

C. Processes and Procedures:

1. Initiation – If the Department Director is within CHS, a written request shall be made to the Dean to consider a recommendation for tenure upon hire/employment. If the hiring official is outside of CHS (e.g., a senior administrative position where they are seeking a tenure position within CHS such as a provost, chancellor who may have background in health care), a written request shall be initiated to the Department Director.

2. Department review – Following the individual department’s policy, the appropriate CHS department reviews the candidate’s file. The department will review a candidate’s record of teaching, scholarship/professional development and service and will consider the candidate’s compatibility with the mission and values of the department and its programs. If the department deems the candidate worthy of consideration for a recommendation for tenure upon hire, the Department Director forwards a written recommendation describing the rationale for making the rank and tenure recommendation to the Dean.

3. The Dean, after reviewing the faculty candidate’s CV and supportive materials, will confirm the recommendation for rank or take it back to the Department Director for further discussion.

4. External Review of Scholarly Products – The Dean, after reviewing the faculty candidate’s CV and supportive materials, has the authority to waive the external review process for scholarly products.

5. Ad Hoc Committee
   a. Appointment – The Dean shall appoint an ad hoc committee in consultation with the CHS Management Team.
   b. Composition - The ad hoc committee shall consist of five tenured faculty members of CHS with at least one tenured faculty member from each CHS department. Committee composition must be consistent with previously stated criteria in section on Promotion Review Committee Composition and Function. If a department does not have a tenured faculty member available, a person(s) external to CHS may be asked to participate on the committee.
c. Chair - The Dean shall appoint a member from the candidate’s department whenever possible as the Chair.

d. Duties – The ad hoc CHS review Committee shall review the tenure case according to the respective criteria outlined in this document. The ad hoc CHS review committee may request, through the Dean, documentation not otherwise obtained through the customary search process. Extensive documentation from a candidate should not be requested unless there is a consensus of the department and/or the ad hoc CHS committee indicating that a candidate appears to not meet the CHS tenure criteria.

e. Recommendation - The ad hoc committee will recommend one of two outcomes, requiring a majority vote:
   i. Tenure upon hire recommended.
   ii. Tenure upon hire not recommended.

f. Report - If the decision of the committee is to not recommend tenure upon hire, the committee will notify the Dean in writing including the vote count and the promotion review committee responsibilities end. If the committee recommends tenure upon hire as evidenced by the vote count, the committee will prepare a written report and forward it to the Dean.

g. If tenure upon hire was recommended, the items to be forwarded to the Dean include:
   i. Department letter of recommendation
   ii. CHS ad hoc committee recommendation report
   iii. Candidate’s curriculum vitae
   iv. A minimum of three letters of reference which address teaching, scholarship, and service.

6. Subsequent actions - The Dean shall communicate all findings of the ad hoc committee to the hiring official and shall forward any recommendations for tenure upon hire to the Provost with the Dean’s endorsement or lack of endorsement.

SECTION V- APPOINTMENT TO CLINICAL ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OR CLINICAL PROFESSOR UPON HIRE (Clinical Track only)

A. Purpose - In special searches and as an integral part of the search process, the CHS faculty may deem it appropriate to recommend appointment of the candidate at the clinical associate professor or clinical professor level. Such a consideration may occur, for example, when hiring a director, associate director, or clinical associate professor/professors of a CHS department or when hiring a senior university administrator who would hold an academic appointment in a CHS department. See other sections of this document for more complete descriptions of criteria for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Professor.

B. Criteria - A faculty member may be recommended for appointment as clinical associate professor or clinical professor upon hire only if sufficient documentation is obtained to consistent with established CHS promotion review criteria. For a candidate who has been granted promotion at another institution, the portfolio may be requested and serve as the
basis for review. Additional documents may be requested for review consistent with position responsibilities. Minimum documentation required includes:

1. Updated curriculum vitae
2. Teaching
   a. Narrative philosophical statement
   b. Most recent year’s teaching evaluations, if available. If not available, alternative evidence may include, but is not limited to:
   c. Past teaching evaluations
      i. Annual evaluations that address teaching expertise and effectiveness
      ii. Evaluations by attendees of teaching or/and clinical education presentations
   d. Documentation of teaching awards if available.
3. Scholarship
   a. Narrative statement addressing the faculty member’s research area(s) of focus, significance in the field, rationale, evidence for progress in the focus areas (past, current, and future), and professional development related to scholarship.
   b. Copies of all publications (pdf preferred). Include impact factor of the journal at time of publication if available and other statistics/information to demonstrate the impact of the journal in the particular field.
4. Service
   a. Narrative statement regarding how service has made a contribution to the profession, and/or communities, schools/universities.
   b. Copies of service awards
5. Practice
   a. Narrative statement addressing the faculty member’s clinical excellence and experience
   b. Documentation supporting clinical excellence and experience.
   c. All transcripts verifying degrees
   d. Proof of current licensure or certifications, if appropriate
   e. Three written references which address teaching, scholarship, and service. One written reference documenting clinical expertise (this may be included in one of the other reference letters).
   f. Additional information as the Review Committee Chair, in consultation with committee, and/or Dean deem appropriate.

C. Processes and Procedures:
1. Initiation – If the Department Director is within CHS, a written request shall be made to the Dean to consider a recommendation appointment at clinical associate professor or clinical professor. If the hiring official is outside of CHS (e.g., a senior administrative position where they are seeking a senior clinical faculty position within CHS such as a provost, chancellor who may have background in health care), a written request shall be initiated to the Department Director.
2. Department review – Following the individual department’s policy, the appropriate CHS department reviews the candidate’s file. The department will review a
candidate’s record of teaching, scholarship/professional development, service, and practice and will consider the candidate’s compatibility with the mission and values of the department and its programs. If the department deems the candidate worthy of consideration for a recommendation for appointment to clinical associate professor or clinical professor, the Department Director forwards a written recommendation describing the rationale to the Dean.

3. The Dean, after reviewing the faculty candidate’s CV and supportive materials, will confirm the recommendation for rank or take it back to the Department Director for further discussion.

4. External Review of Scholarly Products – The Dean, after reviewing the faculty candidate’s CV and supportive materials, has the authority to waive the external review process for scholarly products.

5. Ad Hoc Committee
   a. Appointment – The Dean shall appoint an ad hoc committee in consultation with the CHS Management Team.
   b. Composition - The ad hoc committee shall consist of three faculty from CHS as defined in this document for clinical track faculty promotion reviews.
   c. Chair - The Dean shall appoint a member from the candidate’s department whenever possible as the Chair.
   d. Duties – The ad hoc CHS review Committee shall review the promotion case according to the respective criteria outlined in this document. The ad hoc CHS review committee may request, through the Dean, documentation not otherwise obtained through the customary search process. Extensive documentation from a candidate should not be requested unless there is a consensus of the department and/or the ad hoc CHS committee indicating that a candidate appears to not meet the CHS clinical track promotion criteria.
   e. Recommendation - The ad hoc committee will recommend one of two outcomes, requiring a majority vote:
      i. Appointment to clinical associate professor or clinical professor upon hire recommended.
      ii. Appointment to clinical associate professor or clinical professor upon hire not recommended.
   f. Report - If the decision of the committee is to not recommend tenure upon hire, the committee will notify the Dean in writing including the vote count and the promotion review committee responsibilities end. If the committee recommends appointment as clinical associate professor or clinical professor upon hire as evidenced by the vote count, the committee will prepare a written report and forward it to the Dean.
   g. If appointment as clinical associate professor or clinical professor upon hire was recommended, the items to be forwarded to the Dean include:
      i. Department letter of recommendation
      ii. CHS ad hoc committee recommendation report
      iii. Candidate’s curriculum vitae
iv. A minimum of three letters of reference which address teaching, scholarship, and service.

D. Subsequent actions - The Dean shall communicate all findings of the ad hoc committee to the hiring official and shall forward any recommendations for appointment as clinical associate professor or clinical professor upon hire to the Provost with the Dean’s endorsement or lack of endorsement.

SECTION VI- FACULTY REBUTTAL and GRIEVANCE PROCESS

Rebuttal Process of CHS Tenure and/or Promotion Review Committee Recommendation
The faculty member under review may object to the recommendation of the CHS Review Committee if one of the following conditions exists:
1. A significant omission in the process has occurred, or
2. The decision is clearly prejudicial, inequitable, or unreasonable.

The rebuttal must follow the process outlined below.
1. A formal Rebuttal letter, with supportive evidence, must be submitted to the Dean within 10 working days of receipt of the CHS Review Committee recommendation.
2. After receiving the committee recommendation and the formal rebuttal letter with supportive evidence, the Dean considers both documents and determines whether or not to recommend tenure and/or promotion.

Grievance Process of CHS Dean Recommendation
The faculty member under review may grieve the recommendation of the CHS Dean if the candidate believes one of the following conditions exists:
1. The procedure followed in making such decisions failed to follow University policies and procedures, or
2. Was otherwise manifestly unfair, or
3. That the decisions violated standards of nondiscrimination contained in Regents Bylaw 14.06 (revised September 2007).

No grievance process is available for the CHS Dean’s recommendation within the school. The grievance must follow the process outlined on the Faculty Grievance Procedure on the UM-Flint Faculty-Code.

- A formal grievance letter, with supportive evidence, must be submitted to the Director of Human Resources and the Faculty Council Faculty Grievance Monitor (secretary/chair-elect of Faculty Council or designee).

SECTION VII- CONFIDENTIALITY AND STORAGE OF MATERIALS

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.
**Storage of Materials**
The curriculum vita, copies of the external review letters, committee recommendation, Dean’s recommendation and any documents provided to the Provost’s office will be stored electronically as a permanent record of the school. All materials held by committee members will be destroyed upon completion of the review process. The Dean and Provost require access to the candidates’ full portfolio through May of the review year.
Attachment 1

University of Michigan-Flint
College of Health Sciences
Tenure and/or Promotion Process

**Potential External Reviewers**

* For each potential reviewer, the first column lists appropriate items (i.e. journal articles) to review. Please list the journal articles in order of priority for each reviewer.

** Include external reviewer’s full name, credentials, title/appointment, rank, institution, street address, city, state, phone number, email address, and website link

# Description of external reviewer. Area(s) of expertise. Specifics of how this individual’s training, scholarly work, and accomplishments relates to the candidate’s teaching and scholarship. Please indicate # of publications published by the external reviewer that are related to the candidate’s publications.

^ It is highly recommended that you select external reviewers who are employed in an Institution that has a similar Carnegie classification as UM-Flint (Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs). The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education: [http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/](http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/)

+ Describe any relationship that you have with the potential external reviewer. Understand that the external reviewer relationship should be “at arm’s length”

~ State if the candidate has made any contact with the potential external reviewer concerning serving as an external reviewer or regarding the review, in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Journal Articles or Items for Review</th>
<th>**Name, Contact, Highest Degree, Website and Other Information</th>
<th>^Description of External Reviewer Including Area(s) of Expertise</th>
<th>^Carnegie level</th>
<th>^Candidate’s Relationship with Reviewer</th>
<th>^Previous contact was made regarding review</th>
<th>Committee Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles #, # &amp; #</td>
<td>External reviewer #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External reviewer #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External reviewer #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External reviewer #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External reviewer #5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External reviewer #6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External reviewer #7</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External reviewer #8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reviewer #9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reviewer #10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that an example as to how to complete this table is in attachment 2 below*
Attachment 2: **Example of “Potential External Reviewers Table”**
The journal article numbers should match the numbering of the articles in attachment #2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Articles or Items for Review</th>
<th>Name, Contact, Highest Degree, Website and Other Information</th>
<th>Description of External Reviewer Including Area(s) of Expertise</th>
<th>Carnegie level</th>
<th>Candidate’s Relationship with Reviewer</th>
<th>Previous contact was made regarding review</th>
<th>Committee Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Mary M. Rodgers, P.T., Ph.D. Professor and Chair University of Maryland, School of Medicine; Department of Physical Therapy &amp; Rehabilitation Science; Allied Health Building, Room 115 100 Penn Street, Baltimore, MD 21201. 410-706-5658 <a href="mailto:mrogers@som.umaryland.edu">mrogers@som.umaryland.edu</a> <a href="http://www.medschool.umaryland.edu/profiles/Rodgers-Mary/">http://www.medschool.umaryland.edu/profiles/Rodgers-Mary/</a></td>
<td>Rehabilitation. Dr. Rodgers is Senior Advisor for the National Institute for Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering (NIBIB) at the National Institutes of Health (NIH). She has extensive expertise in the area of biomechanics and has been a well-funded investigator in the study of wheelchair propulsion biomechanics to understand and prevent overuse injury. Her expertise is recognized through 54 publications in peer reviewed journals, six book chapters, one book, and over137 scientific abstracts and conference papers. More recently her scholarship has focused on technology development for rehabilitation, healthy independent living and mobility.</td>
<td>Special Focus Four-Year: Medical Schools &amp; Centers</td>
<td>Only email communication s for Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation for which I review and she is an editorial board member</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>Dennis Fell, PT, MD; Chairman &amp; Associate Professor; College of Allied Health Professions; Department of Physical Therapy, University of South Alabama, 1504 Springhill Ave., Rm 1214, Mobile, AL 36604; 251-434-3575 <a href="mailto:dfell@jaguar1.usouthal.edu">dfell@jaguar1.usouthal.edu</a> <a href="http://www.southalabama.edu/colleges/alliedhealth/pt/faculty.html">http://www.southalabama.edu/colleges/alliedhealth/pt/faculty.html</a></td>
<td>Physical Therapy Education related to evidence base for practice. Continue with more details</td>
<td>Master's Colleges &amp; Universities: Larger Programs</td>
<td>Brief discussions at conferences</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attachment 3: **Potential External Reviewers recommended by Department Director.**

*Director recommended reviewers should be separated from the candidate list of reviewers.

**Department director independently submits the list to the Dean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Journal Articles or Items for Review</th>
<th>**Name, Contact, Highest Degree, Website and Other Information</th>
<th>Description of External Reviewer Including Area(s) of Expertise</th>
<th>^Carnegie level</th>
<th>^Candidate’s Relationship with Reviewer</th>
<th>^Previous contact was made regarding review</th>
<th>Committee Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External reviewer #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reviewer #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reviewer #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reviewer #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reviewer #5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 External Reviewers Submitted by Department Director

*Please note that an example as to how to complete this table is in attachment 2 above*
Attachment 4: **Journal Articles and Items for Review with Recommended External Reviewers**  
*(Grouped by topic)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic #1</th>
<th>Manuscript Title</th>
<th>Authors (bold candidate, underline student(s))</th>
<th>Journal (Prefer link to journal)</th>
<th>Citation Information</th>
<th>Recommended External Reviewers (in preferred order)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Candidate, co-author, student</td>
<td>Journal title</td>
<td>2016;26(2):235-239</td>
<td>Last name, First name Last name, First name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that an example as to how to complete this table is in attachment 5 below*
### Attachment 5: Example of Journal Articles and Items Submitted for Review Table

(This list includes all peer-reviewed publications submitted for review. The items have been listed by topic and numbered to assist the Committee.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Articles/Items (most recent is #1)</th>
<th>Manuscript Title</th>
<th>Authors (bold candidate, underline student(s))</th>
<th>Journal (Prefer link to journal)</th>
<th>Citation Information</th>
<th>Recommended External Reviewers (in preferred order)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Performance in Multiple Sclerosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Effects of a 10-Week Inspiratory Muscle Training Program on Mobility Function in Persons with Multiple Sclerosis</td>
<td>Fry D, Pfalzer L.</td>
<td>Journal of Neurologic Physical Therapy</td>
<td>Submitted September 2008</td>
<td>Last name, First name Last name, First name Last name, First name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Six-minute walk test for persons with mild or moderate disability from multiple sclerosis: performance and explanatory factors</td>
<td>Wetzel J, Fry D, Pfalzer L.</td>
<td>Physiotherapy Canada</td>
<td>2011;63(2):166-80</td>
<td>Last name, First name Last name, First name Last name, First name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Randomized control trial of effects of a ten-week inspiratory muscle training program on measures of pulmonary function in persons with multiple sclerosis</td>
<td>Fry D, Pfalzer L, Chokshi A, Wagner M, Jackson E.</td>
<td>Journal of Neurologic Physical Therapy</td>
<td>2007;31:162-172</td>
<td>Last name, First name Last name, First name Last name, First name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Reliability and validity of four functional tests and rating of perceived exertion in persons with multiple sclerosis</td>
<td>Fry D, Pfalzer L.</td>
<td>Physiotherapy Canada</td>
<td>2006;58(3):212-220</td>
<td>Last name, First name Last name, First name Last name, First name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Therapy Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>Use of threaded discussion to enhance classroom teaching of critical evaluation of the professional literature</td>
<td>Fry-Welch D</td>
<td>Journal of Physical Therapy Education</td>
<td>2004;18(2):48-53</td>
<td>Last name, First name Last name, First name Last name, First name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment 6: Clinical Expertise Reviewers Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name, Contact, Highest Degree, Website and Other Information</strong></th>
<th>^Description of External Reviewer Including Area(s) of Expertise</th>
<th>^Candidate’s Relationship with Reviewer</th>
<th>^Previous contact was made regarding review</th>
<th>Committee Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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External reviewer letter- Tenure Track

[Date]

[Name] [Title] [Department] [Institution] [Street Address] [City, State, Zip]

Dear Professor [Name]:

The College of Health Sciences at the University of Michigan is considering [Candidate Name] for promotion from the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure] to the rank of  [specify rank; specify with/without tenure]. Faculty at the University of Michigan are promoted on the basis of research, scholarly, and creative contributions; teaching ability; 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 [Candidate Name’s] research accomplishments and future promise, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Your scholarly and professional judgments will play an important part in our evaluation of [Candidate Name] for promotion.

[ONLY FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY SEEKING TENURE: Please keep in mind that at the University of Michigan the criteria for the granting of tenure are the same regardless of the length of a candidate’s service as an untenured faculty member. We ask that you be attentive to our policies in your evaluation of [Candidate Name].]

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. With a Carnegie classification as a Masters II institution, candidates for promotion are not expected to present the volume of research and scholarship demanded by a major research institution. However, we expect that their work is of high quality and makes a recognizable contribution to the field. Please take this into account in your evaluation of the enclosed work.

Based on the enclosed materials and any other knowledge you have of [his/her] work or professional accomplishments, we would like your candid evaluation of [Candidate Name’s] written and scholarly contributions in relation to others of comparable experience in [his/her] field. In particular, we would appreciate your comments on the following issues:
1. How do you know [Candidate Name]? (in what capacity and for how long?)

2. What are your impressions about the quality, quantity, focus and scholarly impact of [Candidate Name’s] works?

3. Which, if any, of the scholarly publications or works do you consider to be outstanding?

4. How would you estimate [Candidate Name’s] standing in relation to others in [his/her] peer group who are working in the same field?

5. How would you evaluate [Candidate Name’s] service contributions to the discipline; that is, [his/her] work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?

6. Might [his/her] work meet the requirements for someone being considered for promotion and, if applicable, tenure at your institution?

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. Because the University is 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.

We request that you return your review to us by [Date]. We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise and current research interests.

We realize that your schedule is full and that this may be a time-consuming task; however, we will be most grateful for your assistance. We have selected you because of your expertise in this area. Should you fail to respond, this will be so noted in the promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name] [Title]

Enclosures
Attachment 8. External reviewer letter- Clinical Track (evaluation of scholarship)

External reviewer letter- Clinical Track

SOLICITATION LETTER TEMPLATE At a minimum, the following language is required:

[Date]

[Name] [Title] [Department] [Institution] [Street Address] [City, State, Zip]

Dear Professor [Name]:

The College of Health Sciences at the University of Michigan is considering [Candidate Name] for promotion from the rank of Clinical [specify rank] to the rank of Clinical [specify rank] on the clinical instructional track. Faculty at the University of Michigan on the clinical instructional track are promoted on the basis of clinical expertise; contributions to scholarly productivity; teaching ability; 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 [Candidate Name’s] contributions and future promise, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Your professional judgments will play an important part in our evaluation of [Candidate Name] for promotion.

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. With a Carnegie classification as a Masters II institution, candidates for clinical track promotion are not expected to present the volume of research and scholarship demanded by a major research institution. However, we expect that their work is of high quality and makes a recognizable contribution to the field. Please take this into account in your evaluation of the enclosed work.

Based on the enclosed materials and any other knowledge you have of [his/her] work or professional accomplishments, we would like your candid evaluation of [Candidate Name’s] contributions in relation to others of comparable experience in [his/her] field. In particular, we would appreciate your comments on the following issues:

1. How do you know [Candidate Name]? (in what capacity and for how long?)

2. What are your impressions of [Candidate Name’s] scholarly and professional work?

3. How would you estimate [Candidate Name’s] standing in relation to others in [his/her] peer group who are working in the same field?
4. How would you evaluate [Candidate Name’s] service contributions to the discipline; that is, [his/her] work on regional and/or national professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?

5. Does your institution have a track and rank equivalent to the track and rank in which [Candidate Name] is being considered for promotion? If so, would [Candidate Name] be likely to achieve the equivalent rank at your institution?

[The following paragraph (word-for-word) must be included in ALL letters soliciting an evaluation of the candidate.] 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. Because the University is 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.

We request that you return your review to us by [Date]. We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise.

We realize that your schedule is full and that this may be a time-consuming task; however, we will be most grateful for your assistance. We have selected you because of your expertise in this area. Should you fail to respond, this will be so noted in the promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name] [Title]

Enclosures
Attachment 9
External reviewer letter for clinical practice (Note: These letters are important to the review committee, but are not included in the case book for promotion of clinical track faculty.

[Date]

[Name] [Title] [Department] [Institution] [Street Address] [City, State, Zip]

Dear [Name]:

The School of Health Professions and Studies at the University of Michigan is considering [Candidate Name] for promotion from the rank of Clinical [specify rank] to the rank of Clinical [specify rank] on the clinical instructional track. Faculty at the University of Michigan on the clinical instructional track are promoted on the basis of clinical expertise; contributions to scholarly productivity; teaching ability; 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 [Candidate Name’s] contributions and future promise, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Your professional judgments will play an important part in our evaluation of [Candidate Name] for promotion.

Enclosed is a copy of the portion of our criteria and procedures for clinical track promotion review, a complete vita, and a sample(s) of <his/her> professional work for you to evaluate. Based on the enclosed materials as well as other knowledge you may have of <his/her> work or professional accomplishments, we request your candid evaluation of <his/her> clinical expertise. In particular, we would appreciate your comments on the following issues:

1. Please describe the way in which this person engages in clinical practice in their specialty area and please comment on this individual’s use of best practice.
2. Please describe how <faculty member name’s> expertise has impacted your practice or clinical operation.
3. Evaluate whether the professional development activities in the area of specialty, such as continuing education, certification, and professional memberships, is sufficient to support clinical expertise for this individual.

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. Because the University is 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.
We request that you return your review to us by [Date]. We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise.

We realize that your schedule is full and that this may be a time-consuming task; however, we will be most grateful for your assistance. We have selected you because of your expertise in this area. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name] [Title]

Enclosures
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