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PREFACE

While recognizing the diversity of academic and educational cultures in this complex institution and the need for individual schools and the college to adopt promotion and tenure guidelines that work for them, it is also important that we have an institutional-wide set of norms and expectations. Therefore, we offer the following guidelines as a comprehensive aid in helping units stay consistent with University procedure and requirements for promotion and tenure.

These guidelines include a compilation of information, requirements, and policy from the following sources: Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (Ann Arbor), Standard Practice Guide, Board of Regents Bylaws, and the Faculty Handbook (Ann Arbor campus). The Office of the Provost publicly acknowledges and thanks Jeff Frumkin, Associate Vice Provost and Senior Director for Academic Human Resources for reviewing these guidelines to ensure accuracy and detail.
**PREMISE**

The awarding of tenure to a member of the faculty is one of the most important decisions that the University makes. This decision serves multiple purposes. Since the quality and the strength of an academic institution depend largely on the composition of its tenured faculty, the decision to award tenure must take into consideration the long-term goal of building institutional quality. However, each specific decision affects an individual, to whom we have a responsibility to be fair and accountable. The following principles are intended to encourage an institutional process that will provide a balance between these dual goals.

Tenure is an earned privilege, not a right. The faculty member who is a candidate for tenure has a responsibility to develop professionally, to become a valued member of the academic community, to strive for excellence in research and scholarship, teaching and service, and to seek advice and counsel from the senior faculty members and academic leadership of their unit.

The fundamental premise underlying the guiding principles outlined in this document is that a multi-level review sequence, which embraces the open participation of the candidate, strengthens the integrity of the promotion and tenure review process and builds institutional commitment at each step, without creating an adversarial process.

~ ~ ~

**The Protection of Tenure ► Authority.** Tenure is awarded only by the Board of Regents upon recommendation by the appropriate dean (and executive committee when applicable), by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (Ann Arbor Campus only), by the Chancellor (Dearborn and Flint only), and by the President. (On the Flint campus, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs serves as the Chancellor’s designated representative in all matters of promotion and tenure.) A decision to award tenure is not official unless and until it has been approved by the Board of Regents (Bylaw 5.08). The authority for periodic reviews and tenure reviews resides with the individual schools, colleges, and departments.

*Excerpt from University of Michigan Faculty Handbook > Chapter 6.0*
GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR UNITS

The following guidelines are provided as an aid and also as a checklist to ensure that each unit’s procedures regarding pre-tenure review and criteria for promotion and tenure are equitable and provide faculty with every opportunity for success.

1. Clear and comprehensive, written procedures and standards for promotion and tenure evaluation.
   - Develop a clear set of written procedures with specific deadlines and lists of responsibilities of the candidate.
   - Develop a clear set of written procedures with specific deadlines and lists of responsibilities of each relevant department/program/academic unit.
   - Ensure that these written procedures are made available to all new appointees on arrival and at several stages during their pre-tenure years.
   - Develop standards and criteria for assessing the quality of scholarship and teaching, with special attention to the unique features of interdisciplinary/collaborative activities.
   - In cases of joint appointments, rationalize and coordinate the procedures and standards for promotion among the multiple units of appointment.

2. Appropriate and multi-faceted opportunities for faculty to receive ongoing guidance and feedback on their progress toward achieving promotion/tenure.
   - Develop mechanisms to ensure that faculty have a clear understanding of expectations and that this information is communicated early and repeatedly.
   - Provide the opportunity at appropriate intervals for periodic review and discussion of an individual’s progress.
   - For pre-tenure faculty, conduct a more formal review at an intermediate point in the probationary period (typically after the end of the third year), and provide oral and written feedback that includes candid evaluations and constructive suggestions. Ensure that the message conveyed is an accurate, balanced, and complete assessment of the candidate’s record of accomplishments and the areas that need improvement.
   - Recognize that individuals have unique needs and that they require and respond best to different types of mentoring arrangements. Provide a range of mentoring programs that recognize this diversity of needs.
   - Provide advice and guidance to the candidate in preparing the materials they provide for the promotion casebook.

3. Transparency in the promotion/tenure review process.
   - Allow the candidate to suggest names of external reviewers and names of those whom they would prefer not to be asked to provide letters of recommendation. *(Keep in mind that as of 2012-13, at least two external reviewers must be recommended solely by the Department without input from the candidate.)*
   - At an appropriate state in the review process, according to the practices of the appointing academic unit(s), provide the candidate a summary of the essential points in the casebook on which the recommendation will be based, and allow the candidate an opportunity to submit a written response.

- Establish specific process and procedures used to review promotion casebooks, in accord with the nature of the academic disciplines in the school or college.
- If the school or college includes departments or programs, review recommendations for promotion (both positive and negative) at multiple levels.
- For candidates with joint appointments, ensure that the initial review committee has representatives from each appointment unit. In the original offer letter to the candidate, provide detailed outlines of the joint review process, the expectations of each appointment unit, and the criteria to be used for the evaluation.
- In cases in which a decision not to promote would result in a notice of termination of appointment (i.e., a negative tenure decision), forward the promotion casebook and the recommendations of each evaluating level to the Provost.
- In reviewing both negative and positive recommendations for tenure and promotion, the Provost may accept the recommendation or send the case back to the school or college for reconsideration. The Provost and/or Chancellor may decline to endorse a positive recommendation from the school or college after thorough discussion with the dean. In cases in which the final recommendation from the school or college is negative, a positive recommendation to the Regents by the Chancellor and Provost would occur only after thorough discussion with the dean and only in exceptional circumstances.

5. Explicit safeguards to ensure consistency in the evaluation process at each level of review for all individuals.

- Ensure that senior faculty, department chairs, and administrators, who are responsible for carrying out these policies, know that they must act in good faith and they must conform to institutional and unit requirements.
- Provide mechanisms to encourage senior faculty, department chairs, and administrators, who are responsible for carrying out these policies, to regularly engage in a dialogue about their respective roles and responsibilities. For example, an annual meeting to review institutional issues can accomplish a great deal to ensure compliance and consistency.
- The Provost and Chancellor are responsible for ensuring the academic integrity of the promotion and tenure process at the institutional level.
QUALIFICATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION
IN THE SEVERAL FACULTIES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Since the University of Michigan is responsible for maintaining high standards of teaching, research, and service to the people of the State in a wide variety of fields, it is essential that its faculties be composed of men and women with superior personal and professional qualifications. The following statement is issued for the guidance of administrative officers and of other members of the staff who are responsible for ensuring that all persons appointed or promoted in the several faculties are thoroughly qualified to discharge the duties of their respective positions.

Teaching. Essential qualifications for appointment or promotion are character and the ability to teach, whether at the undergraduate or the graduate level. Some of the elements to be evaluated are experience, knowledge of subject matter, skill in presentation, interest in students, ability to stimulate youthful minds, capacity for cooperation, and enthusiastic devotion to teaching. The responsibility of the teacher as a guide and friend properly extends beyond the walls of the classroom into other phases of the life of the student as a member of the University community. It also involves the duty of initiating and improving educational methods both within and outside the departments.

Research. All members of the faculties must be persons of scholarly ability and attainments. Their qualifications are to be evaluated on the quality of their published and other creative work, the range and variety of their intellectual interests, their success in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods, and their participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals. Attainment may be in the realm of scientific investigation, in the realm of constructive contributions, or in the realm of creative arts.

Service. The scope of the University’s activities makes it appropriate for members of the staff to engage in many activities outside of the fields of teaching and research. These may include participation in committee work and other administrative tasks, counseling, clinical duties, and special training programs. The University also expects many of its staff to render extramural services to schools, to industry, to local, state, and national agencies, and to the public at large.

Appointment and Promotion

In making their recommendation for either appointment or promotion, the responsible departments and colleges will study the whole record of each candidate. To warrant recommendation for initial appointment, candidates must have given evidence either here or elsewhere of their ability to handle satisfactorily the duties of the positions in question. To warrant recommendation for promotions, candidates must have shown superior ability in at least one phase of their activities and substantial contribution in other phases. Naturally, persons who make a distinguished contribution in all aspects of their work may expect more rapid promotion than persons of more limited achievement.

Promotion is not automatic nor does it simply depend on length of service. All promotions are recommended and made on the basis of demonstrated merit. The University endeavors to recognize distinguished performance by adequate increases in salary and early promotion. For this reason a call to another position is not by itself considered a sufficient reason for promotion but may be one of the factors to be taken into consideration in the timing of a promotion.

It is assumed that, as members of the staff mature in experience, they will become more effective teachers and scholars. To that extent the qualifications for appointment and promotion will be progressively more exacting at each successive rank. In particular, promotion to the rank of associate professor, which entails indeterminate tenure, will be approved only when a person has given such clear evidence of ability that they may be expected, in due season, to attain a professorship.
WHO IS ELIGIBLE FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE?

University guidelines permit each school and college to adopt policies concerning promotion and tenure reviews for full- and part-time members of its “regular instructional staff.” However, the maximum length of each school and college probationary period is limited by Regents’ Bylaw 5.09 and the University’s policy on notice of non-reappointment. The University of Michigan-Flint’s established practice, supported by the college/schools’ policies for promotion and tenure, allows the maximum probationary period of seven years. (Faculty would be on probation for five years and go up for tenure in their sixth year.) No faculty member shall remain in a tenure-track position for more than eight years. The University classifies its instructional faculty as described below.

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY CLASSIFICATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

Unless otherwise noted, the appointments described below are appointments not covered under collective bargaining agreements.

Tenure Track Faculty

The tenure track faculty consist of tenure track assistant professors and instructors, and tenure track and tenured professors and associate professors.

Professor and Associate Professor. The title of professor or associate professor is given only to persons of established professional position and demonstrated scholarly or creative ability. The difference between the two ranks is primarily one of achievement. Unless otherwise specified, appointments with these titles are with tenure. An appointment with either title may be made without tenure. Members of the tenured professorial faculty will be appointed by the Board of Regents on the recommendation of:

- the appropriate dean or executive committee, and
- at the University of Michigan-Dearborn or University of Michigan-Flint campus by the chancellor, and
- by the President.

Assistant Professor. The title of assistant professor is given to persons of proven ability who have acceptable experience (a) at the rank of instructor at the University, instructor or higher at another institution, or (b) in professional work. Appointments are without tenure but are tenure-track. They will be appointed by the chancellor (University of Michigan-Dearborn and University of Michigan-Flint campuses) and the president on recommendation of the dean and the executive committee of the appropriate school, college, or division.

Instructor. The title of instructor is given to persons who hold a doctorate or its equivalent in professional experience, or who have completed a major part of the work toward a doctorate, and have shown evidence of special ability as a teacher or scholar. Appointments are made either for one term or, in the case of persons with proven ability, for not more than four years. Appointments are without tenure but are tenure-track. They will be appointed by the chancellor (University of Michigan-Dearborn and University of Michigan-Flint campuses) and the president on recommendation of the dean and executive committee of the appropriate school, college, or division.

Excerpts from SPG 201.34-1
CRITERIA FOR TENURE

After the appropriate probationary period (see below), tenure may be granted to those instructional staff members whose professional accomplishments indicate that they will continue to serve with distinction in their appointed roles. The criteria for tenure and the criteria for promotion are similar, but not identical. Tenure is awarded to those who demonstrate excellent teaching, outstanding research and scholarship, and substantial additional service, each of which must be relevant to the goals and needs of the University, college and department. The award of tenure is based on the achievement of distinction in an area of learning and the prediction of continued eminence throughout the individual’s professional career. The Regents will not confer tenure unless the instructional staff member achieves or gives strong promise of achieving promotion in rank within the University.

TENURE PROBATIONARY PERIOD

The maximum probationary period of non-tenured instructional staff consists of service with the University for a total of eight years in the rank of “full-time” instructor or higher; however, the University of Michigan-Flint’s expected and established practice is for five years of probation with a recommendation for tenure in the sixth year. (See “Appointment Fraction,” below for the definition of full-time – SPG 201.13.) Those who are not recommended for tenure are normally offered a one-year terminal contract for the year following the review. As explained below, one year may be excluded from the countable years of service that constitute the relevant tenure probationary period in the case of childbearing or dependent care under the auspices of SPG 201.92. (See also Section 16.C.4, “Family and Medical Leave Act” of the UM Faculty Handbook.) Tenure may be conferred after a shorter period than specified above, depending on the policies of the individual schools and colleges. It is possible for faculty to be hired with tenure depending on the credentials of the individual.

In determining how many years of service count toward the probationary period the following rules apply:

Title and Rank. The appointment must be a regular instructional staff appointment at the rank of instructor or higher. (See SPG 201.34-1) Periods of service in lecturer appointments or adjunct, clinical or visiting appointments do not count toward the tenure probationary period.

Appointment Fraction. The instructional-track appointment must be “full-time” within the University, which means an academic year or academic term appointment fraction of 80% or more as recorded in the official notice of appointment. The appointment may be split between two or more instructional-track appointments as long as the total effort is at least 80% (SPG 201.13).

Service. Each year of the appointment must be spent:

- in resident at the University of Michigan; or
- on paid duty off campus; or
- on Scholarly Activity Leave (SPG 201.30-4), for periods of one year or less, unless the individual and the unit agree in writing to an exception to this provision at the time the leave is granted, and the exception is approved in writing by the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (for UM-Flint, the Chancellor).
Note: As the rules above indicate, periods of duty spent off campus or on scholarly activity leave are usually counted as part of the probationary period and therefore do not stop the tenure clock.

Changes in Appointment. Any change in title, rank, appointment fraction, or service that stops or starts the tenure clock requires the prior written approval of the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (for UM-Flint, the Chancellor). (SPG 201.13.II.A.)

PRE-TENURE REVIEWS FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Units should conduct periodic reviews of full-time non-tenured regular instructional staff members with the rank of instructor or higher. These periodic reviews need not include external inquiries and appropriately may be less exhaustive than tenure reviews. Faculty members should check with their dean or director for information about unit-level policies and procedures for these reviews and obtain a copy of any written guidelines (SPG 201.50).

Recommendations to reappoint or not reappoint non-tenured members of the regular instructional staff are made by the department chair or the dean, but should be based on reviews that include formal faculty involvement, rather than being based solely on individual determinations of the chair or dean (SPG 201.50).

GUIDELINES RELATED TO TENURE REVIEWS

The Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs recommends that before any decision is made within an academic or research unit to recommend promotion to a tenured appointment, the faculty member should be notified that the question is under consideration and encouraged to see that the files to be reviewed contain current and relevant material.

A faculty member may request a tenure review at any time, but the decision to conduct a tenure review is within the discretion of the chair or dean, according to the policy of the school or college. Usually, the review for tenure is conducted during the faculty member’s sixth year of appointment.

The tenure review must include a careful examination of the candidate’s credentials and performance and should be conducted by a committee of the faculty. The review should incorporate both internal and external evaluations.

Tenure recommendations to the dean should be made by a committee, the majority of who are tenured members of the school or college faculty. Tenure recommendations that are to be forwarded to the Regents shall proceed according to Bylaw 5.08.

Tenure recommendations and other tenure decisions of the school or college should be communicated to the candidate in writing in a timely fashion. Instructional-track faculty members who have not been recommended for tenure after a tenure review are normally offered a one-year, terminal contract for the next year, their last year at the University.
JOINT (DIVIDED) APPOINTMENTS AND PARTIAL APPOINTMENTS

A joint appointment (formerly called a divided appointment) occurs when a faculty member holds appointments in more than one unit (for example: in two academic units; in an academic unit and a research unit; or in an academic unit and an administrative unit). A partial appointment is an appointment that is less than 100% effort. If the instructional track portion of a partial appointment is less than 80% effort, the tenure clock does not run during the time the appointment is below 80%. Any changes in title, rank, or appointment fractions that start or stop the tenure clock require the prior written approval of the Provost. (SPG 201.13)

Guidelines for Joint Academic Appointments at the University of Michigan (available at http://www.provost.umich.edu/ (see Faculty Information) and SPG 201.39-1 Principles and Practices Governing Tenure for Faculty Members with Divided or Partial Appointments are the primary source documents for joint appointments.

A key principle for conducting tenure reviews of faculty with joint academic appointments is described in “Guidelines for Joint Academic Appointments”:

Whenever possible, the deans’ offices should agree on a single joint process for making promotion and tenure decisions about the jointly appointed faculty member.

A unified process for evaluation for promotion and tenure is the clearest and simplest way to ensure that both schools and colleges are represented in the promotion process while reducing the faculty member’s sense of double jeopardy from duplicate processes. When it is not possible for the schools and colleges to agree on a single process, the deans’ offices should discuss the time and key elements of the promotion processes in each academic unit so that the overall process can be streamlined, synchronized, and shortened. It is critical for each school or college to know what the other is doing and for the candidate or faculty member to know what each school or college is doing.

Any school or college conducting a tenure review for a faculty member who holds a second appointment in another school or college must notify the second school or college of its intentions and work together to ensure that the two review processes are coordinated.

Year-to-year fluctuations in actual assignments across different appointing units do not change a unit’s responsibility for the faculty member’s tenured appointment fraction. That is, the fraction of the appointment that is formally tenured in any given unit is the portion of the appointment that is afforded the protections of tenure. (SPG 201.39-1) If tenure in a unit is associated with a fractional appointment, the University is not obligated to increase that individual’s appointment beyond that fractional appointment.

Excerpts from University of Michigan Faculty Handbook > Chapter 6.H
THE TENURE CLOCK

The following information and associated Regents Bylaws are based on a tenure clock timeline that Ann Arbor adopted wherein the maximum length of time a tenure track faculty member may hold a full-time tenure track appointment without being granted tenure or terminated is ten years; however, the Flint campus continues to follow the maximum tenure clock timeline without being granted tenure or terminated as eight years. There are some departments on the Ann Arbor campus that are following the ten-year rule; however, most of them continue to use eight years as their guide. Therefore, the reader will notice clarification, where necessary, in the following language.

According to common usage among faculty, the term “tenure clock” refers to the number of years a faculty member may serve in a tenure track appointment prior to being granted tenure or, when tenure is denied, including his or her terminal year of appointment. The University has a number of rules governing the length of the tenure clock and when it starts and stops. Some of these rules are University wide; others are specific to schools and colleges. To understand the tenure clock for any individual, one must understand how both University-wide and school or college rules apply to the individual case.

When a tenure track faculty member joins the University, two clocks begin to run. One is the relevant school or college tenure clock. The other is the University-wide tenure clock.

**University-Wide Tenure Clock.** Regents Bylaw 5.09 *Procedures in Cases of Dismissal, Demotion, or Terminal Appointment,* establishes the maximum length of time a tenure track faculty member may hold a full-time tenure track appointment without being granted tenure or terminated (i.e., the “University-wide tenure clock”). Bylaw 5.09 states (in its relevant part) that any tenure track faculty member who has held a University appointment at the level of instructor or higher for a total of ten years (Flint campus – eight years) is entitled to the procedures of Bylaw 5.09 before the University can make a recommendation to the Board of Regents for dismissal, demotion, or termination of the faculty member.

Thus, the University (Ann Arbor) views the nine years as a deadline within which the University must either grant tenure to, or terminate, a tenure track faculty member. Except in extraordinary cases, a school or college must make the decision about tenure for a faculty member no later than the end of the faculty member’s ninth year on the University-wide tenure clock.

The Flint campus follows a maximum eight-year tenure track timeline. Under this timeline, tenure track faculty are recommended for tenure in their sixth year and the seventh year is considered the terminal year. Under situations where a tenure track faculty member may have been approved for a clock stoppage (discussed in subsequent sections), then the faculty member would go up for tenure in the seventh year, with the eighth year as being the terminal year. Under very rare circumstances, a tenure track faculty member could go up for tenure in the eighth year; however, the eighth year would also serve as the terminal year should tenure not be granted. (All schools on the Ann Arbor campus, except the Medical School, as well as the Dearborn campus, follow the same timeline as the Flint campus.)

**School or College Tenure Clock.** When a school or college creates a set of rules for tenure review, one of the key choices it makes is to determine when the tenure review will normally occur. This decision by the schools and colleges may align with the University-wide tenure clock. Because the
Flint campus is viewed/considered as one unit, our college and schools’ timeline must be the same, i.e. the maximum of eight years. The School or College Tenure Clock may also be shorter than the University-wide tenure clock for some faculty members who are, for various reasons, ready to go up early for tenure.

At the same time, the schools and colleges have some flexibility with respect to the timing of the tenure review in special circumstances wherein they can request to delay the review by the Provost. For example, a faculty member’s research laboratory may have been damaged by a massive water leak, which significantly hampered his research. The school or college would typically conduct the tenure review in the faculty member’s sixth year. In this situation, the school or college could conduct the tenure review in the seventh year. In other words, the school or college may decide to exclude a year of service from a faculty member’s school or college tenure clock for one year, thereby postponing the tenure review to accommodate the need for repairs to the laboratory. This exclusion does not alter the faculty member’s years of countable service on the University-wide tenure clock (again, eight years for the Flint campus).

COUNTING OF SERVICE TIME TOWARDS TENURE

Countable years of service in a tenure track position begin to accrue on the University-wide tenure clock on the day when a faculty member is first appointed to a tenure track title with an appointment of at least eighty percent (80%) effort. (The countable years is another name for a faculty member’s tenure clock, and for the Flint campus, cannot exceed eight years even if there are any tenure clock stoppages.)

Schools and colleges differ in when they start the school or college tenure clock (for countable years of service) for tenure track faculty members whose appointments begin at times other than the summer or early fall. In this situation, some schools and colleges do not begin the countable years of service until September 1 of the academic year following the appointment, and some begin the clock retroactively on the September 1 preceding the appointment. So long as the school or college uses a consistent practice and the faculty members involved understand their own situations, either option is acceptable. In all cases, the University-wide tenure clock begins on whatever date the faculty member is first appointed.

TENURE CLOCK STOPPAGE

From the time a faculty member begins at least an 80% appointment on the tenure track, each year is counted on the University-wide tenure clock, unless countable years of service are excluded under one of the policies described below. These exclusions are recommended at the school or college level and require the approval of the Provost.

Childbirth. In accordance with SPG 201.92, the dean of a school or college will, upon written request from a tenure track faculty member who has given birth, exclude up to one year from the faculty member’s countable years of service. This is intended to stop both the school/college and the University-wide tenure clocks. The policy provides for only one year of exclusion, even if the faculty member has more than one childbirth. The Policy may not be used to exclude the year of the scheduled tenure review from the school/college tenure clock and the University-wide tenure clock.
(i.e. if the tenure review process is scheduled to begin in the summer of 2012, and the faculty member gives birth in the summer of 2012, the 2012-13 year of service may not be excluded). Note that an exclusion is guaranteed so long as the faculty member meets all the eligibility criteria.

Dependent Care. In accordance with SPG 201.92, the dean may upon written request from a tenure track faculty member, request to exclude up to one year from the faculty member’s countable years of service to recognize the demands of dependent care. Dependent care includes children, parents, spouses or partners, and other dependents. Faculty members who have adopted a child are eligible for this exclusion as well. Again, this policy is intended to exclude a year of service from the school/college and University-wide tenure clock. Faculty members may be eligible for one year of exclusion for either childbirth or dependent care but not both. Only one year may be excluded by countable service under this policy.

In addition, the following exclusions are available and also require recommendation by the dean and approval by the Provost:

Health, Personal Emergencies, and Other Extenuating Circumstances. To recognize health, personal emergencies, or other extenuating circumstances in accordance with SPG 201.13 (Section II.B), the faculty member may make a written request to the Dean to exclude one or more years of service on the University-wide tenure clock. If the Dean recommends approval, he or she must submit the request to the Chancellor, or his/her designee, for review and receive prior written approval before any years of service may be excluded from the University-wide tenure clock.

Reduced Appointment. When a faculty member’s appointment fraction drops below eighty percent (80%) for the academic year, the year may be excluded from countable years of service if recommended by the Dean and approved in advance and in writing by the Chancellor, or his/her designee. Without advance approval in writing by the Chancellor, or his/her designee, a decrease in appointment fraction to below 80% does not stop the University-wide tenure clock.

Note: Paid or unpaid leaves of absence are counted toward years of service unless the Dean requests that the Chancellor, or his/her designee, approves excluding this time from countable years of service.

When the Dean requests from the Chancellor, or his/her designee, an exclusion of years of countable service from the University-wide tenure clock, such requests should be addressed in writing to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, with a copy to Flint-Human Resources. The written request should include the date of hire for the faculty member, process used to decide to request an extension (such as executive committee approval or department chair recommendation), rational to exclude years of countable service, other facts or documentation relevant to the case, and the date by which the faculty member will be reviewed for tenure if the extension is approved.

Any exclusions of countable years of service from the school/college tenure clock or the University-wide tenure clock to accommodate childbirth, dependent care, illness, or other personal emergencies, do not alter the criteria by which schools and colleges will review faculty members for tenure. Deans are responsible for ensuring that executive committees, promotion and tenure committees, ad hoc committees, and external reviewers are informed that the criteria for tenure do not change when one or more years of service have been excluded from a faculty member’s tenure clock.
When a faculty member has been granted exclusions from either tenure clock, the Dean should explain such exclusions in the materials provided to the Chancellor’s Office, or his/her designee, for the recommendation for or against granting of tenure. Explanations of these exclusions help reviewers of the case to calibrate the faculty member’s years of service.

TERMINAL YEAR APPOINTMENTS AND NOTICE OF NON-REAPPOINTMENT

University practice and SPG presumption is that if someone is denied tenure at the end of their probationary period, it is grounds for a terminal year. Also, if a faculty member withdraws their opportunity for tenure review, it is considered a resignation. When there is a decision by a department, school, or college not to recommend reappointment or tenure, the faculty member should be notified of that decision in writing as soon as possible. (See SPG 201.88) Faculty members should be offered the opportunity to discuss the decision at their request. The notification is the responsibility of the administrative head of the unit or department in which the decision is made.

The terminal year appointment must fall within the seven-year UM-Flint Tenure Clock. SPG 201.88 Notice of Non-Reappointment requires the University to notify a tenure track faculty member in a timely way that the University will not extend his or her appointment beyond the terminal year. Guidelines for giving notice of non-reappointment, as set forth in SPG 201.88, are listed below. These are minimum requirements; school or college procedures may provide for earlier notice.

- Regular instructional staff members with one year of continuous service or less shall be given notice of non-reappointment at least three months before the scheduled expiration of that appointment.
- Regular instructional staff members with more than one year but less than two years of continuous service shall be given notice of non-reappointment by December 15 if the appointment expires at the end of the following winter term. In cases of appointments terminating at other times, notice will be given no later than five months before the termination date.
- Regular instructional staff members whose years of continuous service have extended beyond two years shall be given notice of non-reappointment not later than September 15 of the fall term of the last academic year of the appointment. If the appointment is scheduled to terminate at some time other than the end of the winter term, notice of non-reappointment shall be given no later than nine months before the end of that appointment.

As mentioned above, the schools and colleges differ in when they start the school/college tenure clock (for countable years of service) for tenure track faculty members who appointments begin at times other than September 1. However, all the schools and colleges must calculate the date by which they will provide advance notice of non-reappointment counting from the date on which the school or college first appointed the faculty member to the tenure track appointment.
Negative Cases

When there is a decision by a school or college not to recommend reappointment or tenure, the negative case should be forwarded to the Provost for additional review in accordance with the “Promotion and Tenure Review” timeline provided by the Provost in May of each year (Appendix A). The Provost will review all cases, positive and negative, and make a judgment on each. Negative cases do not have to be reported to Ann Arbor.

THE TIMING OF THE TENURE REVIEW

If a school or college has not notified the faculty member of a non-reappointment, it must initiate a tenure review not later than the first semester in the faculty member’s sixth year of countable years of service on the UM-Flint Tenure Clock. See SPG 201.50 Guidelines Related to Tenure Reviews and Reappointment Reviews. (Obviously, if any period of a faculty member’s appointment has been excluded from countable years of service on the University-wide tenure clock, the timing of the mandatory tenure review needs to be adjusted accordingly.)

A faculty member may request a tenure review at any time prior to the beginning of the sixth year. The school or college has the discretion to decide whether to grant the request.

Who Is Responsible for Record Keeping

The Dean’s office in each school or college is responsible for maintaining up-to-date records on each tenure rack faculty member’s status on the University-wide Tenure Clock and the UM-Flint Tenure Clock.

De facto Tenure

If the University fails to notify the faculty member of non-reappointment in accordance with the requirements of SPG 201.88, the faculty member may be entitled to receive an instructional appointment after his or her eighth year of service. Such an appointment would entitle the faculty member to the protections of Regents Bylaw 5.09 without having received tenure.

This is the most severe consequence for not properly managing the University-wide tenure clock. This entitlement is sometimes referred to as de facto tenure, a misnomer that derives from the fact that even though the Board of Regents has not awarded tenure to the faculty member, he or she has the same protections of Bylaw 5.09 that apply to tenured faculty members.

Grievances

If a school or college does not follow its own tenure review procedures and the procedures specified in University policy, the faculty member may subsequently file a grievance. In that case the school or college’s actions (or inaction) may become grounds for questioning the tenure decision.
THE PROTECTION OF TENURE

The University safeguards academic freedom by its policy that no person who has been awarded tenure by the Regents or who has been employed by the University for a total of eight years at the rank of a full-time instructor or higher may, thereafter be dismissed, demoted or recommended for terminal appointment without adequate cause and an opportunity for a review in accordance with Bylaw 5.09, except pursuant to the Program Discontinuance Guidelines. See Section 5.J of the University of Michigan Faculty Handbook, “Status of Academic Appointments When Academic Programs are Discontinued,” and SPG 601.02.

Authority. Tenure is awarded only by the Board of Regents upon recommendation by the appropriate dean (and executive committee when applicable), by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (Ann Arbor Campus only), by the Chancellor (Dearborn and Flint only), and by the President. (On the Flint campus, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs serves as the Chancellor’s designated representative in all matters of promotion and tenure.) A decision to award tenure is not official unless and until it has been approved by the Board of Regents (Bylaw 5.08). The authority for periodic reviews and tenure reviews resides with the individual schools, colleges, and departments.

SECTION 5.09
PROCEDURES IN CASES OF DISMISSAL, DEMOTION, OR TERMINAL APPOINTMENT (revised November 1993)

1. Applicability. The procedures prescribed in this section shall be followed (a) before recommendation is made to the Board of Regents of dismissal or demotion of a tenured member of the University teaching staff or of any member of the teaching staff during the term for which any member of the teaching staff is appointed; or (b) before recommendation is made to the Board of Regents of dismissal, demotion, or terminal appointment of a teaching staff member holding appointments with the University for a total of ten years in the rank of full-time instructor or higher. Subject to pursuing these procedures a recommendation of dismissal, demotion, or terminal appointment may be made for causes accepted by University usage, properly connected with the improvement and efficiency of the faculty, and consistent with the character of the tenure involved. [Underlining added.]

2. Initiation of Proceedings. Proceedings which may result in a recommendation of dismissal, demotion, or terminal appointment may be initiated by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs [Provost on Flint campus] or by the executive authority (dean, director, or executive committee) of the school, college, or other unit (hereinafter called the administrative unit) in which the affected faculty member is employed. In exceptional cases which, in the judgment of the President, [Provost on the Flint campus] threaten direct and immediate injury to the public reputation or the essential functions of the University, the president may direct that the affected faculty member be relieved of some or all of his or her University duties and responsibilities, without prejudice and without loss of compensation, pending the final disposition of the case.

3. Proceedings Dependent on Classification of Case. Cases involving matters concerning primarily the administrative unit in which the affected faculty member is employed shall be subject to the procedures provided for by subsection 4 of this section. Cases involving matters of general University concern shall be subject to the procedures provided for by subsection 5 of this section. The Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, [Provost on Flint campus] before initiating action with respect to a faculty member, shall notify the President, [Chancellor on Flint campus], SACUA, and the
executive authority of the administrative unit. The President, [Provost on Flint campus], after consulting with SACUA and the executive authority of the administrative unit, shall determine whether the case shall be handled under subsection 4 or subsection 5 of this section. The executive authority of an administrative unit, before initiating action with respect to a faculty member, shall notify the President [Provost on the Flint campus], and SACUA, and the President, [Provost on the Flint campus], after consulting with SACUA, shall determine whether the case shall be handled under subsection 4 or subsection 5 of this section. The President’s [Provost on the Flint campus], determination shall be communicated in writing to SACUA and the executive authority of the administrative unit.

4. Procedure in Cases Referred to the Executive Authority of the School or College.

a. Upon referral by the President [Provost on the Flint campus] of a case to the executive authority of an administrative unit, the executive authority shall promptly give written notice thereof to the faculty member affected and to SACUA. The notice shall state with reasonable particularity the charges which the executive authority proposes to investigate and shall advise the faculty member that the faculty member may, upon making written request not more than ten days after receipt of the notice, have the right to a hearing.

b. The executive authority shall promptly investigate a case referred to it; and, if the faculty member has requested a hearing, shall provide for a hearing either (1) before the executive committee of the administrative unit or (2) before a special ad hoc faculty committee appointed by the executive authority with the approval of the executive committee or the governing faculty of the administrative unit. The affected faculty member may (1) have an adviser of the faculty member’s own choosing who may act as counsel; (2) be present at all sessions of the hearing committee at which evidence is received or argument is heard; (3) call, examine, and cross examine witnesses; and (4) examine all documentary evidence received by the hearing committee. A full stenographic record of the hearing shall be taken, and the hearing committee shall, with reasonable promptness, file a written report on the case, together with a transcript of the record of the hearing, with the executive head of the administrative unit, SACUA, and the President [Provost on the Flint campus]. The report shall contain the hearing committee’s conclusions and recommendations and the reasons therefore. If dismissal, demotion, or terminal appointment is recommended, the report shall contain a specific statement of the deficiencies or acts of misconduct on which the recommendation is based, and a copy of the report shall be delivered to the faculty member.

c. If the hearing committee recommends that adverse action be taken against the faculty member, the executive authority of the administrative unit, before considering the matter further, shall advise the faculty member in writing that the faculty member may have a review of the case by the standing subcommittee on tenure appointed by the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs as provided in subparagraph (d) of this subsection. If the hearing committee recommends that adverse action should not be taken against the affected faculty member, but the executive head of the school or college, upon review of the hearing committee’s report and the record, disagrees with its recommendation and concludes that the executive head of the school or college should recommend adverse action against the faculty member, the executive head of the school or college shall notify the faculty member in writing of his or her recommendation, and with reasonable particularity of the reasons therefore, and shall advise the faculty member that the faculty member may have a review of the case as provided in subparagraph (d) of this subsection.
d. The request of the faculty member for review of the faculty member’s case by the review committee shall be presented in writing to the chair or secretary of SACUA within ten days after receipt by the faculty member of the notice from the executive head or authority of the administrative unit that adverse action against the faculty member has been recommended. The request for review shall be referred to the standing Subcommittee on Tenure appointed by SACUA and designated by it as the review committee. The review committee shall promptly, but upon not less than ten days’ written notice to the faculty member and to the executive head of the administrative unit, conduct a hearing in the matter, of which a full written record shall be taken. The review committee shall review the record, reports, and recommendations transmitted by the hearing committee and may in addition receive new evidence. The faculty member, either in person or through a representative or both, and the executive head of the administrative unit shall have the right to appear, to comment on the proceeding before the hearing committee and on its findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and to examine and rebut any new evidence received by the review committee. A full record shall be kept of the review proceeding.

e. In conducting its review of the case, the review committee shall take account of all relevant factors, including consideration of the questions (1) whether the hearing committee observed the procedure prescribed in this subsection, (2) whether the hearing committee accorded a fair hearing, (3) whether the deficiencies or acts of misconduct on which the hearing committee’s recommendations are based are related to the charges stated in the first instance as the basis for investigation, (4) whether the proceeding as it developed before the hearing committee involves matters of general University concern, and (5) whether the weight of the evidence, as it appears in the record and as supplemented by any further evidence by the review committee, supports the hearing committee’s findings and recommendations. In determining what its recommendation shall be, the review committee shall be free to make any recommendation appropriate to its findings and conclusions respecting either the procedural or meritorious aspects of the case.

f. Within thirty days following its hearing, the review committee shall file a written report with the affected faculty member, the executive head of the administrative unit, the President, [Provost on the Flint campus], and SACUA. The report shall contain the committee’s conclusions, recommendations, and the reasons therefore. There shall be filed with the report a transcript of the record of the hearing conducted by the review committee.

g. The faculty member and SACUA may, within ten days after receiving the review committee’s report, file written comments thereon with the President [Provost on the Flint campus] and, in the case of the faculty member, with the executive head of the administrative unit. Within twenty days after it receives the hearing committee’s report, the executive authority of the administrative unit shall notify the President [Provost on the Flint campus] of its final recommendations in the case.

h. The President [Provost on the Flint campus] shall thereafter review the record in the case and shall formulate his or her own recommendations and the reasons therefore. The affected faculty member and SACUA shall be furnished copies of the President’s [Provost on the Flint campus] recommendations and may, within ten days after receiving the same, submit to the President [Provost on the Flint campus] written comments respecting the recommendations. The full record of the case, including the recommendations of the President [Provost on the Flint campus] and any comments by the affected faculty member or SACUA, shall then be transmitted by the President [Provost on the Flint campus] to the Board for final action.
5. Procedure in Cases Referred to SACUA

Upon referral of a case by the president to SACUA, the committee shall designate its standing Subcommittee on Tenure to serve as a hearing committee and shall refer the case to it for hearing. The hearing committee shall promptly give written notice to the faculty member affected. The notice shall state with reasonable particularity the charges (as prepared by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs) [Provost on the Flint campus] which the committee proposes to investigate, and shall advise the faculty member that the faculty member may, upon making written request not later than ten days after receipt of the notice, have the right to a hearing before the committee.

a. The hearing committee shall promptly investigate a case referred to it, and may call upon any member of the University faculty or staff for relevant information. The Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, [Provost on the Flint campus], or a representative, may be present at all meetings of the committee, and may present such evidence as the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs [Provost on the Flint campus] deems appropriate. The executive authority of the administrative unit in which the affected faculty member is employed may be present or represented at all meetings of the committee and if it wishes to make any recommendations, shall make them to the committee prior to the conclusion of the committee’s investigation, whereupon such recommendations shall become a part of the committee’s record in the case. If the affected faculty member requests a hearing before the committee, a full stenographic record of the hearing shall be taken. The affected faculty member may (1) have an adviser of the faculty member’s own choosing who may act as counsel; (2) be present at all sessions of the hearing committee at which evidence is received or argument is heard; (3) call, examine, and cross examine witnesses; and (4) examine all documentary evidence received by the hearing committee.

b. Within a reasonable period of time after the referral of the case to the hearing committee, the committee shall file a written report with SACUA. The report shall contain the committee’s conclusions, recommendations, and the reasons therefore. If dismissal, demotion, or terminal appointment is recommended, the report shall contain a specific statement of the conduct on which the recommendation is based. There shall be filed with the report the complete written record in the case, including the recommendations, if any, made to the committee by the executive authority of the school or college and a transcript of the record of any hearings conducted by the committee.

c. If the committee recommends that adverse action be taken against the faculty member, SACUA shall advise the faculty member affected that the faculty member may request the Senate Advisory Committee to review the proceeding conducted by the hearing committee. The faculty member’s request for a review shall be presented in writing to the chair or secretary of SACUA within ten days thereafter. Upon receipt of this request SACUA may in its discretion conduct a hearing for the purpose of determining whether the hearing committee granted a fair hearing and followed the procedure prescribed by this subsection. If such a review hearing is granted, the faculty member, either in person or through a representative or both, shall have the right to appear and to comment on the proceeding before the hearing committee. A full record shall be kept of the review proceeding.
d. If SACUA determines that the hearing committee failed to grant a fair hearing or to follow the prescribed procedure, it shall set aside the committee’s findings and conclusions and remand the case to the committee for a new hearing in accordance with the procedure prescribed by this subsection. A written report of the action taken by SACUA, together with the record of its review proceeding, shall be filed with the affected faculty member, the executive head of the administrative unit, the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President [Provost on the Flint campus].

e. If the hearing committee recommends that adverse action should not be taken against the affected faculty member, or if it recommends that adverse action be taken and the affected faculty member does not request a review by SACUA, or if in case a review is requested and granted it is determined that the hearing committee granted a fair hearing and followed the prescribed procedures, SACUA shall file the hearing committee’s report and recommendations together with the complete written record in the case with the affected faculty member, the President, the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs [Provost on the Flint campus], and the executive authority of the administrative unit. In filing the report and record with the President [Provost on the Flint campus], SACUA may also include its comments on the hearing committee’s findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The affected faculty member, the executive authority of the administrative unit, and the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs [Provost on the Flint campus] may, within ten days after receiving copies of the hearing committee’s report and the record, file written comments with the President [Provost on the Flint campus].

f. The President [Provost on the Flint campus] shall thereafter review the record in the case and shall formulate his or her own recommendations and the reasons therefore. The affected faculty member and SACUA shall be furnished copies of the President’s [Provost on the Flint campus] recommendations and may, within ten days after receiving the same, submit to the President [Provost on the Flint campus] written comments respecting the recommendations. The full record of the case, including the recommendations of the President [Provost on the Flint campus] and any comments by the affected faculty member or SACUA, shall then be transmitted by the President [Provost on the Flint campus] to the Board for final action.
INFORMATION FOR DEAN OFFICES AND ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS RESPONSIBLE FOR PREPARING PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS

~~ Faculty: For Your Information Only ~~

PREPARING AND SUBMITTING PROMOTION AND TENURE DOCUMENTS

Approximately July of each year, the Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs and Senior Director for Academic Human Resources, Jeff Frumkin, sends out information/directions for instructional promotions to the Chancellor, the Provost and Deans. That information should be your guide in developing and submitting documents to the Office of the Provost (Flint) on behalf of your faculty for purposes of promotion and/or tenure. However, because those informational packets are written in terms of the procedures on the Ann Arbor campus, sometimes they tend to be a little confusing especially for new deans and/or staff. For purposes of clarifying the responsibility level on the Flint campus, the following information is being provided as an aid to complement what Associate Vice Provost Frumkin provides each year but in no way supersedes his directions. We hope that you will find this helpful. When the Office of the Provost or Provost Office is referenced below, we are referring to the Flint campus.

General Information

A casebook is a required compilation of information regarding a tenure track teaching faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure for submission to the Office of the Provost and subsequently to the Board of Regents. Because electronic filing of casebooks is required, we would ask that all documents to the Provost Office be sent electronically with the exception of those that require a signature. In terms of timeline, please refer to the most recent memo from the Office of the Provost, Appendix A. All casebooks will be submitted no later than the date designated by Associate Vice Provost Frumkin, normally around mid-February. Promotion recommendations will be acted upon by the Regents in their May meeting with effective dates of September of each year. No recommendation for promotion and tenure is final until approved by the Regents. Any announcement prior to that date is premature and should be avoided.

For each faculty member being promoted on the instructional track, at least five external “arm’s length” letters are required, and more are highly desirable. Faculty candidates may have input in establishing a list of external reviewers to contact; however, at least two of the external reviewers that submit a letter, must be selected solely by the Department, without input from the candidate.
Please be reminded that it is the Dean’s responsibility to contact individual faculty regarding a negative decision for promotion; however, all negative cases, including support documentation or materials that were used by the school or college in reaching any negative decision, must be submitted to the Provost for review for his/her final recommendation.

Wise and objective decisions about appointment, promotion, and tenure are essential for enhancement of the overall quality of the institution. Your attention to the guidelines provided, and the consistency therein, will be appreciated.

Casebook information should be sent to the Office of the Provost based on the timeline provided in Appendix A. Please adhere to the timeline.

Responsibility Level and Documents That Comprise the Casebook for Instructional Tenure Track Faculty

Who is Responsible

1. Summary Cover Memorandum
   From Chancellor ........................................Provost Writes on Behalf of Chancellor

2. Unit Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Research/Scholarship and Service........................................Dean’s Office Submits to Provost

   Each dean submits a most recent copy of their college/school’s criteria that they have established for promotion and/or tenure of their faculty. These criteria should address how the college/school and the various promoting departments define and evaluate teaching, research, and service in their areas.

3. Documentation for Each Candidate:
   a. Promotion Recommendation (or Regents Communication)
      (See Appendix B)........................................Dean Submits to Provost

      • This document, which is prepared for the Regents, should present a brief assessment of the overall performance and achievements of the individual being recommended.
      • Include information about the individual’s contribution in the context of the unit’s mission.
      • Include the date of May of the current year, at the end of this document.
      • Please submit a draft to the Provost Office. The Provost Office will review, obtain pre-approval from Ann Arbor, and return a final version for the Dean’s signature. The final, signed original is then returned to the Provost Office. (Do not staple.)

   b. Cover Letter from the Dean/Director ........................................Dean Submits to Provost

      • Provide a subject line with the candidate’s name, all current titles, and Employee ID number.
      • Indicate both the years in rank for the current appointment, and if applicable, the years in rank at Michigan.
      • Indicate whether any of the candidate’s years of service have been excluded from the tenure clock and the reason(s).
This assessment should be written from an evaluative, not an advocacy, perspective and should present a balanced summary of the case.

Indicate whether any of the candidate’s years of service have been excluded from the tenure clock for childbirth, dependent care, medical or other reasons.

Please highlight and discuss in detail any special circumstances concerning this individual, e.g., early promotion requests.

It is important that non-traditional forms of scholarly production are given as much scrutiny as the more traditional/disciplinary work. Moreover, we want to ensure that individuals receive full credit for their contributions to interdisciplinary and/or collaborative scholarly projects.

Describe the outcome of the promotion review at each stage of evaluation in the unit. Please summarize the evaluative comments of the unit’s promotion review committee and/or executive committee and include the final vote tally (for example, 4-2, and not names) of any faculty group that voted on the promotion recommendation.

Explain your reasons for recommending promotion, and tenure (if appropriate).

If the candidate holds joint appointments, indicate the fraction of effort for each title.

c. **Chair/Department Letter** ................................................. **Dean’s Office Submits to Provost**

Submit any letters or reports from department to the Dean recommending a decision for or against promotion. If the recommendation is at odds with the decision of a review committee, that should be explained.

d. **Curriculum Vitae** ...................................................... **Dean’s Office Submits to Provost**

(Provided by the Candidate to the Dean’s Office)

Please be sure to check the accuracy, completeness and timeliness of the information in the curriculum vitae, e.g., that publications listed as “in press” are really in press and that the degrees indicated have been awarded. (Make sure the vitae is a recent copy and that it has at least one-inch margins.)

e. **Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness** .......................... **Dean Submits to Provost**

While we recognize that different cultures prevail in different units with respect to the nature and the evaluation of teaching, the University places a high value on providing students with an outstanding educational experience. We therefore strongly encourage units to develop and utilize teaching portfolios. (See Appendix C)

The Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness should consist of five pieces of information as follows:

- Please include the Dean’s overview of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness, followed by the candidate’s own teaching statement. The Dean’s overview should include teaching evaluation information with comparative data if available. Do NOT include individual student feedback.

  (Candidate provides teaching statement to Dean)
f. Documentation of Research or Creative Work ........................................ Dean Submits to Provost

- The Documentation of Research or Creative Work should consist of three pieces of information as follows:

  - The Dean provides a brief description of the candidate’s most significant research finding or creative contributions keeping in mind that it will be read by non-specialists and needs to be accessible to a broad audience. The reader should be able to understand the substance of the work and importance.

  - Candidate’s own research statement including potential relevant topics including conventions of publication in the field, sources of external funding, expectations about co-authorship in research teams, norms about work with doctoral and post-doctoral mentors, significance of awards, and other topics as appropriate. (Please spell out names avoiding using acronyms.) Do not include CD’s, DVD’s, drawings, photos, journal articles, and/or copies of grant applications. (Candidate provides Research Statement to Dean)

  - Summary of Scholarly Work (refereed and significant non-refereed publications, book chapters, in process publications, conference activity, etc.) in bibliography format.

g. Documentation of Service ..................................................... Dean’s Office Submits to Provost

- A listing of both internal and external service is desired. (Please spell out names avoiding using acronyms.) (Candidate provides Listing of Service Activities to Dean)

h. Sample of Letter Sent to External Reviewers to Solicit Recommendations (Appendix D) ........................................... Deans Submit to Provost

- Include a copy of the solicitation letter. See samples in Appendix D that, for legal reasons, we strongly encourage you to use. Note that the text emphasized in BOLD italic font in both sample letters MUST be included in all solicitation letters. It is the responsibility of the Dean to ensure that department chairs, or the appropriate equivalent, follow one of two templates provided.

- There are two samples: one for a candidate who does not have an interdisciplinary appointment, and one for the candidate who does have an interdisciplinary appointment.
• The copy of the solicitation letter submitted to the Provost should NOT contain candidate names or specific information regarding the candidate, but rather, it should look like a template.

i. **Credentials of External Reviewers -- Dean’s Office Submits to Provost Reviewers and their Relationship to the Candidate (Appendix E)**

• Dean’s Office provides a listing of external reviewers in alphabetical order who provided a review letter designating each reviewer as “arm’s length” or “not arm’s length.” For clarification, those external reviewers who would be deemed “not arm’s length” would be those, for example, who have served as perhaps a candidate’s thesis adviser, co-author, mentor, or major collaborator. If you include a reviewer that is “not arm’s length,” then they would have to be in addition to the minimum requirement of five. Include external reviewer’s contact information: name, title, name and address of university, college or school, department where employed, phone number, and email address. **(Number each reviewer with a letter, such as Reviewer A, Reviewer B, etc.)**

• Also indicate for each whether the candidate had input recommending the external reviewer or whether the department recommended the external reviewer without the input of the candidate. A minimum of two reviewers who were selected solely by the department, without in input of the candidate is required.

• Include a short bio for each external reviewer of approximately 5-6 sentences. Bios should include a brief description about each reviewer with significant information such as area of research, something about current work, honors, or anything noteworthy that would enhance is qualifications as a reviewer of scholarly work. **(See Appendix E for sample paragraphs of reviewers.)**

• A listing of external reviewers, in alphabetical order, who were asked to write a letter but declined, providing the reason for declining, and a short bio.

• **Emerita/emeritus faculty are not allowed as external reviewers.**

j. **Evaluation Letters by all External Reviewers............... Dean’s Office Submits to Provost (at least five “at arm’s length” are required)**

• **All of the external review letters must be included.** Again, these should be from reviewers at or above the rank of the candidate being considered. If the circumstances necessitate letters from out-of-rank reviewers, permission needs to be sought from the Provost in advance; however, these should be used in rare circumstances and for a good reason.

• **Original letters, if possible, should be submitted to the Provost Office. DO NOT STAPLE OR PUNCH HOLES IN LETTERS.**

• **Electronic copies of external reviewer letters are acceptable.** If they are received without a signature or not on letterhead, please submit a copy of the email that was used to send the correspondence. The copy of the email needs to show an electronic address containing an educational source. For example: sefabbro@umflint.edu would be acceptable because part of the address shows it would be coming from a university by virtue of “edu”.
k. **Internal Review Letters (optional) ........................................ Dean’s Office Submits to Provost**

- Internal review letters are not required, but if letters were solicited, they must be included. Internal review letters may be helpful if they are from faculty in other units who can attest to the value of a faculty member’s work, particularly interdisciplinary and clinical work.

4. **Archive of Materials ............................................................ Responsibility of the Dean’s Office**

- The promotion recommendation is a summary document. **Please note that all supporting documentation should be retained in each candidate’s departmental personnel file for six years beyond the current fiscal year.**
- Support documentation such as candidate notebooks, publications, etc. that were submitted to the Office of the Provost will be returned following successful approval by the Board of Regents in their May meeting.

5. **Non-Discrimination Review of Promotion and Tenure Decisions**

    The University is committed to ensuring that all individuals are treated fairly and are not disadvantaged because of their race, ethnicity, or gender. In reviewing faculty for promotions, schools and colleges are reminded of these responsibilities and are encouraged to consider such promotions carefully to ensure that neither rank nor tenure relationships are affected negatively by considerations of gender, race, age, or other irrelevant characteristics.

**Responsibility Level and Documents That Comprise the Casebook for Clinical Faculty**

It is important that the clinical track parallel the instructional and research tracks in that it the regional/national impact on one’s field that should justify a senior academic rank. However, “arm’s length” letters from persons who may not be known to the candidate, but who have a clear sense of the significance of the candidate’s qualifications, are unlikely to tell the story insofar as teaching and clinical work are concerned. Therefore, it would be reasonable, for clinical track faculty only to have up to two of the five “arm’s length” evaluative letters from local sources (not mentors or scholarly collaborators nor persons who are in the same department as the candidate, but those persons who have seen the clinical work and actual teaching). **At least three of the remaining letters would need to be “arm’s length” as typically defined.**

Decisions of the promotion of clinical track faculty members are reported to the Board of Regents rather than recommended. (This means that a Promotion Recommendation would not be included in a clinical track faculty member’s casebook.)
DOs and DO NOTs for Submitting Casebook Information

**DO** refer to department chair as “chair” or “chairperson” (not “chairman”).

**DO** use the wording “is recommended for the granting of tenure to be held with his/her title of …” if a faculty member is being recommended for “tenure only.” This would be done in the Regents Communication.

**DO** be consistent in punctuation of journals, articles, and book titles. Book titles are underlined, names of journals are italicized, and articles are encased with quotation marks.

**DO** use the candidate’s name that is listed on the HRMS system.

**DO NOT** submit a curriculum vitae with candidate’s birthday, age, marital status, social security number, or other personal information.

**DO NOT** use University-specific language in reviewers’ quotes. To protect anonymity of reviewers, substitute [my institution], or something similar.

**DO NOT** use the word “young,” even when quoting a reviewer. Substitutes: [of his cohort] or [of his/her generation].

**DO NOT** staple anything.

**DO NOT** refer to faculty members as “Dr.” They should be referred to as “Professor,” especially in the Regents Communication. The only time that we are allowed to use “Dr.” is if the candidate is a medical doctor.
Appendix A

Promotion and Tenure Review Timeline
The strength of a university rests on the quality of its faculty. Apart from hiring, no decisions we make are more important than those involving faculty tenure and promotion. Through hiring, tenure, and promotion, we ensure the sustained quality of our institution.

As you know, there are specific procedures for promotion and tenure review, some at the unit level, others at the university level, and still others at the system level. The procedures are designed to provide faculty with a fair review and to ensure that the standards of the institution are met. I count on the deans to make sure that proper procedures are followed and that promotion and tenure decisions are made exclusively on the basis of the applicant’s record. If at any point during the process you have any questions please do not hesitate to bring them to me.

This memorandum provides a timeline for the 2014-2015 promotion and tenure review process. The timeline is firm. Please remember that all promotion and tenure cases must be submitted to Ann Arbor electronically. Formatting of all documents we send must be perfect. Receiving properly formatted materials from your office, on time, will enable us to meet the February deadline set by Ann Arbor.

One critical part of the review process involves external letters. Please pay considerable attention to who is selected. Although letters may be secured from individuals who are “at arm’s length” and “not arm’s length,” I strongly encourage you to use reviewers who have not had a sustained relationship with the candidate (e.g., the candidate’s dissertation advisor, textbook co-author, or friend in graduate school). Please also note that the procedures specify: It is important that the candidates be allowed to give input concerning the selection of some external reviewers; however, this year we are required to include two that have been selected solely by the department. Another important consideration in selecting reviewers involves rank and institution. The guiding principle for reviewer selection must be their ability to submit a thoughtful and appropriate assessment of the candidate’s professorial record. Traditionally, our campus emphasizes to external reviewers that we are primarily a teaching institution and that we are more interested in the quality of the research than the quantity. Whenever possible, select full professors (remember that all reviewers must be of higher rank than the candidate). Also, consider institution type and prestige. Although letters from faculty at leading research universities can be impressive, the authors may not be in a position to understand the realities of the life of a teacher-scholar at an institution like ours. Similarly, letters from reviewers at universities of less prestige than ours may not be afforded sufficient credibility. Also, seek regional diversity when selecting reviewers. Please remember that you must provide a brief description of the credentials of external reviewers. Be sure that the brief description offers compelling information on the reviewer’s qualifications. You need to do more than to write: “Reviewer X does the same research as the candidate.” Finally, be sure that you send solicitation letters to external letters on a timely basis. My experience is that it is best to make initial requests via phone. That way you find out right away if the person is willing to write.
the letter and can do it within the time required. You may also wish to seek at least eight reviewers rather than five so that you end up with at least five letters. **(We are urging that all cases include a minimum of six letters.)** All letters received must be forwarded with the recommendation. In other words, if you solicit and receive seven external review letters, all seven must be submitted.

Please note that Ann Arbor has specific guidelines for the letters to external reviewers and for other details of the promotion/tenure process. Documents updating these details for this promotion/tenure cycle will be forthcoming. In addition to any changes regarding your unit criteria for promotion and tenure, **I am also requesting your guidelines with specific and detailed procedures regarding how you conduct your promotion/tenure reviews.**

**PROVOST OFFICE TIMELINE  (Schools/college will need to set deadlines to meet this timeline.)**

**June, 2014**
Identify faculty being recommended for promotion and/or tenure and submit names to the Provost Office.
Develop list of potential external reviewers for each candidate; submit said list to the body/committee within your unit for approval.

**July, 2014 (or before)**
Send solicitation letters to potential external reviewers.

**August, 2014**
Review tenure/promotion procedures at the unit, university, and system level.
Check to make sure appropriate committees are constituted.
Confirm external reviewers for each candidate.
Verify that external reviewers meet all criteria.

**September 9, 2014**
Send electronically to the Provost Office the sample letter to external reviewers.
Submit electronically to the Provost Office any changes in your unit Promotion and Tenure criteria as well as detailed guidelines regarding your promotion/tenure review process.
Send electronically to Provost Office:
• Updated vita for each promotion/tenure candidate.
• List of confirmed external reviewers for each candidate, with brief description of their credentials.

**December 5, 2014**
Send to the Provost Office the original external review letters and the status of any external review letters that have not been received. If any letter from an external reviewer is not yet on file, the Dean is to issue a reminder.
Submit electronically to Provost Office:
• Documentation of teaching effectiveness by both the Dean and the candidate
  ➢ Evaluation Template
  ➢ Evaluation Questions
  ➢ Peer Evaluations
  ➢ (2) Syllabi

**January 5, 2015**
Submit completed promotion packets to Provost Office.
Submit electronically to Provost Office:
• Summary Letter from Dean.
• Curriculum vitae (if updated from the one sent in September).
• Documentation of research.
• Documentation of service.
• Regents Communication.

**This is a firm deadline. Early submission is encouraged.**
February 1, 2015  Provost Office will submit recommendations approved by the Provost and overall summary to the Office of the Chancellor.

February, 2015  *(Specific date to be provided by Ann Arbor.)* Provost Office, on behalf of the Chancellor, will submit the recommendations approved by the Chancellor to the Office of the Provost in Ann Arbor. UM-Flint Provost Office will have all documents posted to C-Tools as well as checksums and metadata information.

May, 2015  Office of the President will submit the recommendations to the Board of Regents for final approval. Approvals are effective as of September 1, 2015.

sf

cc:  Ruth J. Person, Chancellor
    Beth Manning, UM-Flint Human Resources
    Melissa Richardson, School of Education and Human Services
    Kristin Arntz, School of Management
    Sheena Lewis, College of Arts and Sciences
    Cheryl Szpaichler, School of Health Professions and Studies
    Becky Waller, Frances Willson Thompson Library
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Format for Promotion Recommendations
(Regents Communications)
APPENDIX B

Format for Instructional Faculty Promotion Recommendations
(Regents Communications)

An outline of the format to be used for promotion recommendations follows. Try to limit each recommendation to no more than three pages; however, up to five is permissible. The margins should be no less than one inch on each side with no page numbering. Do not staple.

The tenure status (with or without) for promotions to associate and professor must be indicated. Also, if a faculty member has a fractional instructional appointment in another unit of the University, please supply this information on the recommendation. Any other titles that do not need the approval of the Regents, such as adjunct professor, research scientist, etc., should be listed under the Professional Record section of the promotional material. If the individual is being recommended for “tenure” only (without a change in title), please use the wording “is recommended for the granting of tenure to be held with his/her title of (insert title).”

Please note that all UM-Flint Promotion Recommendations would include three signature lines: Dean, Provost, and Chancellor.

Following the outline is a sample Promotion Recommendation as well as a listing of sample first paragraphs to use within recommendations.
SAMPLE PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION
The University of Michigan
College of Engineering

John C. Doe, associate professor of electrical engineering and computer science, with tenure, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, College of Engineering, is recommended for promotion to professor of electrical engineering and computer science, with tenure, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, College of Engineering. (See additional samples of this first paragraph at the end of this sample promotion recommendation.)

Academic Degrees:

Ph.D. 1991 University of Illinois, Computer Science, Urbana-Champaign
M.S. 1988 University of Illinois, Computer Science, Urbana-Champaign
B.S. 1986 Duke University, Physics and Computer Science, Durham, NC

Professional Record:

2002 – present Associate Professor (with tenure), Department of Electrical Engineering and
Computer Science, University of Michigan
1994 – 2002 Engineering Manager, Advanced Design Technology, Motorola, Inc., Austin, TX
1993 – 1994 Staff Engineer, Semiconductor Systems Design Technology Group, Motorola, Inc.,
Austin, TX
1992 – 1993 Development Staff Member, IBM Corporation, Endicott, NY

Summary of Evaluation:

Teaching: Professor Doe is an excellent educator, both inside and outside of the classroom. He has taught a range of courses, from a large lower-level course on logic design that is required for all undergraduates in computer engineering, to an upper-level undergraduate course on VLSI (very large scale integrated) circuit design, and an advanced graduate course on VLSI that involves a very sizeable design project, to which he brings his considerable industrial experience. He has also introduced and taught special topics courses on two occasions. His performance in the classroom has yielded very high student evaluations, with Q1 scores ranging from 4.22 to 4.79, and Q2 scores between 4.30 and 4.77. He puts significant effort into class preparation and into helping his students learn, and this is highly respected and appreciated by those students.

Professor Doe is also an outstanding mentor. Since joining the University in 2002, he has graduated eight Ph.D. students, with three more expected to graduate before the end of 2012. In addition, he has advised several Master’s Degree students, many of whom have contributed directly to his research projects and publications. He currently has a research group comprised of approximately ten students.

Professor Doe’s skill and enthusiasm were recognized with the 2005 University of Michigan Henry Russel Award for “Exceptional Scholarship and Conspicuous Ability as a Teacher.”

Research: Professor Doe is a nationally and internationally renowned leader in the field of low-power robust VLSI circuit design. When he came to Michigan in 2002, he had already established himself as one of the leading researchers in VLSI. At Michigan, he continued the work he had begun at Motorola on timing analysis of digital circuits, signal integrity, and power distribution within integrated circuits. He has also initiated research projects on several new topics, including low power and robust systems. His work on producing robust digital systems that can tolerate the non-determinism that creeps into highly miniaturized logic devices has been particularly influential in the field. He has also recently begun a cross-disciplinary collaboration with the Kellogg Eye Center to place a very low power processor and pressure sensor in the human eye.
Professor Doe is an extraordinarily prolific researcher: in the nine years since coming to Michigan, he has published approximately 150 papers in journals and strongly refereed conferences. Moreover, the quality of these papers is very high, with four winning best paper prizes and several more being nominated for them. He has also obtained eight patents and has four more pending. He has raised over $4,000,000 in research support, counting only his share of collaborative projects. Further evidence of the impact of his work is provided by the large number of industrial seminars that he has been invited to present at corporations including Intel, Philips, ARM, Toyota, Nvidia, and Synopsys, amongst others.

Recent and Significant Publications:


Service: Professor Doe performs extensive professional service, as befits a professor. He is an associate editor for a major IEEE publication; has served multiple times as co-chair of the technical program for one of the leading computer hardware conferences; and, has served as a member of the technical program committee and/or executive committee for dozens of major conferences over the past few years. Internally he has been a chair and member of the EECS Undergraduate Committee, as well as the Graduate Admissions Committee, and he served as an undergraduate advisor.

External Reviewers:
Reviewer A: “He is highly sought after and I am certain that he would have no difficulty in obtaining a faculty position at the rank of full professor at the top 5 Universities in the country.”

Reviewer B: “John is an outstanding researcher and has been recognized for his contributions to the fields of high-performance and low-power integrated circuit design methodology and computer-aided design tools.”

Reviewer C: “Overall, Prof Doe has addressed relevant problems and achieved significant scientific accomplishments.”

Reviewer D: “When serving as an external evaluator of a case for promotion to Professor, I look for three things: significant contributions in more than one research area, successful PhD students graduated, and leadership service to one’s profession. John clearly gets an A in research contributions. John also gets an A in leadership service to his profession. He has graduated three PhD students to date with a whole slew in the pipeline...they are well prepared and have worked on challenging and forward looking project [sic] for their dissertation research.”
Reviewer E: “He is exceptionally creative, with both an uncanny feel for what should work, as well as the drive to make it work.”

Reviewer F: “He has become one of the global leaders in the field of advanced integrated circuits and the associated design methodologies, and is bound to do his department pride [sic].”

Reviewer G: “...he is a world-class researcher and is a real asset to any top class University.”

Reviewer H: “He has a broad portfolio of first-rate research publications in this general area [chip-level large-scale analysis and optimization], including some very prominent Best Paper Awards and nominations...”

Reviewer I: “It is particularly notable that his work has been widely cited by other researchers, and much of it has been put into practice in industry...”

Reviewer J: “John’s research in low-power design is of exceptional quality. I have seen his work cited extensively in journals and conference papers everywhere.”

Reviewer K: “...one of the most outstanding researchers and recognized names in the VLSI CAD and design automation community worldwide.”

Summary of Recommendation: Professor Doe is a very prominent and very productive computer engineer who has made significant contributions to the field of VLSI CAD. He is an excellent teacher and mentor; and he is a leader who contributes both in external and internal service. It is with the support of the College of Engineering Executive Committee that I recommend John C. Doe for promotion to professor of electrical engineering and computer science, with tenure, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, College of Engineering.

David C. Munson, Jr.
Robert J. Vlasic Dean of Engineering
College of Engineering

May 2013
SAMPLE FIRST PARAGRAPHS FOR THREE-PAGE RECOMMENDATIONS

Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, without tenure:
Daniel Peters, assistant professor of biological chemistry, Department of Biological Chemistry, Medical School, is recommended for promotion to associate professor of biological chemistry, without tenure, Department of Biological Chemistry, Medical School.

Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, with tenure:
Paul Chessman, assistant professor of internal medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Medical School, is recommended for promotion to associate professor of internal medicine, with tenure, Department of Internal Medicine, Medical School.

Promotion from associate professor, without tenure, to associate professor, with tenure (granting of tenure only):
Mark Bloom, associate professor of information, without tenure, School of Information, is recommended for the granting of tenure to be held with his title of associate professor of information, School of Information.

Promotion from associate professor, without tenure, to professor, with tenure:
George Jackson, associate professor of anesthesiology, without tenure, Department of Anesthesiology, Medical School, is recommended for promotion to professor of anesthesiology, with tenure, Department of Anesthesiology, Medical School.

Promotion from associate professor, with tenure, to professor, with tenure:
Anthony Jones, associate professor of aerospace engineering, with tenure, Department of Aerospace Engineering, College of Engineering, is recommended for promotion to professor of aerospace engineering, with tenure, Department of Aerospace Engineering, College of Engineering.

Promotion in one school/college, but not the other (needs signature of both deans, or acknowledgement memo from second dean):
Jane Doe, associate professor of business economics, with tenure, Stephen M. Ross School of Business, is recommended for promotion to professor of business economics, with tenure, Stephen M. Ross School of Business [also associate professor of economics, without tenure, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts].

Promotion in two schools/colleges (needs signature of both deans):
John Smith, associate professor of dentistry, with tenure, School of Dentistry, and associate professor of biological chemistry, without tenure, Medical School, is recommended for promotion to professor of dentistry, with tenure, School of Dentistry, and professor of biological chemistry, without tenure, Medical School.

Promotion in two schools/colleges, but not the third (needs signature of all three deans, or signatures of two deans from promoting schools and acknowledgement memo from third dean):
Jody Fisher, associate professor of English language & literature, with tenure, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts and associate professor of information, without tenure, School of Information is recommended for promotion to professor of English language & literature, with tenure, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts and professor of information, without tenure, School of Information [also associate professor of history, without tenure, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts].

Promotion in one school from associate professor, with tenure, to professor, with tenure, and promotion from research associate professor to research professor:
Matthew Rainier, associate professor of Neurology, with tenure, Department of Neurology, Medical School, is recommended for promotion to professor of Neurology, with tenure, Department of Neurology, Medical School [also being promoted to Research Professor, Life Sciences Institute].
Appendix C

Teaching Portfolio Info
THE TEACHING PORTFOLIO

Matthew Kaplan

At institutions across the country, faculty are creating opportunities to exchange ideas on teaching and, in the process, becoming more reflective about their teaching. In part, this is a response to national discussions about the false dichotomy that is often drawn between teaching and research. To move beyond this debate, there have been calls for expanding the idea of scholarship to include certain teaching products, as well as research products (Boyer, 1990). Three strategies for taking a scholarly approach to reviews of teaching are ones that are common to discussions of research as well (Shulman, 1993). First, scholarship is firmly grounded in the disciplines, and a scholarly approach to the review of teaching would focus on the teaching of a specific discipline. Second, just as research becomes scholarship when it is shared, faculty would need to begin making teaching community property. And finally, scholarship often involves making judgments about faculty work, which, for teaching, would mean that faculty would become more involved in reviewing each others' accomplishments in teaching and learning.

The teaching portfolio is one of the tools faculty can use to document their scholarly work in teaching. This Occasional Paper contains a discussion of the nature and purpose of the teaching portfolio (and its offshoot, the course portfolio) and suggestions for how individuals and units can use portfolios most effectively.

What Is a Teaching Portfolio?

A record of accomplishments in teaching

Based on the model of the portfolio kept by artists and architects, the teaching portfolio contains evidence of a faculty member’s achievements in teaching: “What is a teaching portfolio? It includes documents and materials which collectively suggest the scope and quality of a professor’s teaching performance . . . . The portfolio is not an exhaustive compilation of all of the documents and materials that bear on teaching performance. Instead, it presents selected information on teaching activities and solid evidence of their effectiveness” (Seidin, 1997, p. 2).

Documentation in context

The portfolio should be more than a simple collection of documents.

Matthew Kaplan is an instructional consultant in the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching.
It also should contain reflective statements on the material included and on the faculty member's approach to teaching and student learning. The reflective portions of the portfolio help set the documents in context for the reader; the materials provide evidence to back up the assertions made in the reflective statement.

**What Might Go into a Portfolio?**

When considering the contents of a portfolio, faculty must distinguish clearly between being representative and being exhaustive. Attempts to create an exhaustive compendium of an instructor's work in teaching run the risk of becoming exhausting, both for the person collecting the materials and for any readers who might choose (or need) to respond to the portfolio. Furthermore, the attempt to be completely comprehensive can turn the project of developing a portfolio into a paper chase. Such a large collection of documents makes it difficult to maintain the reflective aspect of the portfolio, which is one of its chief purposes and advantages.

The portfolio should, instead, be representative of the various aspects of a faculty member's teaching. This means looking beyond the most obvious part of teaching—what goes on in the classroom. While the activities and interactions with students in class are important, they do not fully reflect faculty work with teaching. Other items might include planning courses, assessing student learning, advising students (in office hours or in larger projects such as theses and dissertations), curriculum development and assessment, supervising student research, working to improve one's teaching, and publishing articles on teaching and learning.

One way to categorize items that a faculty member might include is to divide them into three categories based on the source of the item: materials from oneself (e.g., reflective statements, descriptions of course responsibilities, syllabi, assignments), materials from others (e.g., statements from colleagues who have observed or reviewed teaching materials, student ratings, letters from students or alumni, honors or recognition); and products of good teaching (student essays or creative work, a record of students who have succeeded in the field, evidence of supervision of theses). Some of these sources may be more appropriate for certain aspects of teaching than for others. See Appendix A for a more comprehensive list.

**Purposes of Portfolios**

**Self-reflection and improvement**

Assembling a portfolio involves reflection. Most portfolios include a reflective statement that can cover topics such as the instructor's approach to teaching and learning, his or her assumptions about the roles of students and teachers, and goals the instructor expects students to achieve (Chism, 1997-998). In addition, faculty need to collect documents that support their reflective statement, a process that also involves reflection (selecting some items over others, reviewing past work, etc.). As a result, the portfolio is well-suited to helping faculty examine their goals for teaching and student learning, and compare those goals to the reality of their praxis.

The comparison between the ideal and the real is the first step in the process of improving teaching. Instructors can gain a sense of how effective their teaching is and how they could improve from a variety of sources: student ratings of instruction, midsemester feedback, self-perception, discussions with colleagues, etc. By constructing a portfolio, faculty will look systematically at the various sources of data about their teaching; therefore, they can make more informed decisions about teaching strengths on which they wish to build and problems in their teaching they wish to address. The reflection and improvement process can be further enhanced when faculty work together (either individually or in pairs or small groups) as they develop their portfolios. Colleagues can offer support and advice, exchange new ideas and solutions to problems, and broaden each other's views of the teaching and learning process. Moreover, such exchanges help create a community of scholarship around teaching that is based on a concrete, discipline-specific context.

**Decision making**

Accomplishments in teaching are becoming a more important factor in administrative decisions such as tenure, promotion, reappointment, and merit increases. The teaching portfolio enables faculty and departments to ensure that an instructor's work in teaching is judged using multiple forms of evaluation, seen by multiple eyes. This is important, since no one perspective can accurately represent faculty teaching. For instance, students can evaluate certain aspects of teaching that focus on classroom interactions, such as organization, rapport, and ability to stimulate discussion. On the other hand, faculty colleagues are in a position to judge items that are
beyond the expertise of students, such as how up-to-date material is, how well a course is integrated into the curriculum, etc.

Self-evaluation and reflection are also important, especially for providing a context for understanding data about teaching effectiveness. The portfolio as a whole gives individual faculty a sense of control over the evaluation process. In addition, departments that encourage faculty to submit portfolios will need to have discussions about what, if any, documents will be required and what will be left up to the individual faculty; how long the document can (or should) be; and how much reflection is required. Such discussions provide a useful venue for creating a shared sense of what constitutes good teaching in a department.

Graduate student portfolios

Graduate students who apply for faculty positions commonly use portfolios because many colleges and universities now require job applicants to provide some proof of teaching experience. Graduate students are turning to the portfolio as a way of organizing their work in this area. Currently, the requirements vary widely among schools. Some require just a list of courses taught or a reflective statement on teaching, and some ask for specific items (such as proposed syllabi for certain types of courses, student ratings, demonstrations of commitment to undergraduate research, etc.). The earlier in their teaching careers that graduate students begin to think about their portfolios, the more chance they will have to retrieve the documents they find most representative of their accomplishments. Aside from its value for the job market, the portfolio often represents the first time graduate students have had the opportunity to reflect on their teaching, which they often find both challenging and rewarding.

An Alternative to the Teaching Portfolio: Course Portfolios

A variation on the teaching portfolio is a course portfolio. As the name implies, these documents focus on a specific course, with a special emphasis on student learning. A course portfolio, therefore, is analogous to a scholarly project. It includes sections on goals (intended student learning outcomes), methods (teaching approaches used to achieve outcomes), and results (evidence of student learning) for a specific course.

Moreover, it is the relationship or congruence among these elements that makes for effectiveness. We expect a research project to shed light on the questions and issues that shape it; we expect the methods used in carrying out the project to be congruent with the outcomes sought. And the same can be said of teaching.

By encompassing and connecting all three elements – planning, implementation, and results – the course portfolio has the distinctive advantage of representing the intellectual integrity of teaching. (Cerbin, 1993, p. 51)

Course portfolios offer advantages for the person developing them as well as for the curriculum. For the faculty member developing the portfolio, the advantages are similar to those of assembling a teaching portfolio (e.g., self-reflection and a chance to compare intentions with outcomes), but with more in-depth insight into the impact of teaching on students. For departments, course portfolios can provide continuity and reveal gaps in the curriculum. For example, a course portfolio becomes a record of the purpose and results of a course that can be passed on to the next person in charge of that course or to the faculty member who teaches the next course in a sequence. By examining a set of course portfolios, a curriculum committee can gain an overview of what students are learning and what is missing, which could help with the process of curriculum revision.

How are Portfolios Evaluated?

Just as there is no one model for a teaching portfolio, there is no one method for evaluation. Again, this is a strength of the portfolio, since it means that individual units will need to develop criteria for evaluation and make them relevant to faculty in that unit. The process of deciding on criteria can also help to clarify what faculty in that unit value with respect to teaching. For one example of an evaluation scheme, see Appendix B.

As units develop criteria for evaluating portfolios, they should first consider the ways they plan to use the portfolio. Will portfolios be limited to faculty being considered for tenure or promotion or for instructors nominated for teaching awards, or will all faculty prepare a course portfolio in preparation for a department-wide curriculum review? These purposes differ and so should the requirements for the portfolios involved.

Once the purpose is clear, faculty will probably want to create guidelines for assembling portfolios. While it is important to maintain the flexibility of the portfolio, it is also necessary to insure some degree of
Consistency in order to make evaluation fairer and more reliable. Faculty might establish consensus on required items, such as a page limit for the overall size of the portfolio, the focus (a single course, an overview of teaching, or a combination), opportunities for reflection, or a template (so that faculty do not need to worry about format and can concentrate instead on the content). Ideally, such guidelines will be established with input from potential reviewers in the unit as well as those faculty who will be under review.

Advantages of Portfolios

In the AAHE monograph The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship of Teaching, the authors describe four main benefits of the teaching portfolio (Edgerton, Hutchings, & Quinlan, 1991, pp. 4-6). Course portfolios have similar attributes.

1. Capturing the complexity of teaching
   - Portfolios contain evidence and reflection in the context of what is being taught to whom under what conditions.
   - The portfolio can present a view of a teacher’s development over time.
   - Entries in the portfolio can be annotated to explain their significance for the faculty member’s teaching.

2. Placing responsibility for evaluation in the hands of faculty
   - Faculty are actively involved in presenting their own teaching accomplishments so that evaluation is not something done “to” them.
   - Portfolios extend evaluation beyond student ratings and encourage peer review and collaboration.
   - The need to evaluate portfolios can lead to discussions on standards for effective teaching.

3. Encouraging improvement and reflection
   - Assembling a portfolio involves reflection.
   - Because they involve reflection, portfolios allow faculty to compare their ideals with their actions, a first step in efforts to improve.
   - A faculty member’s portfolio reveals both products (evidence) and processes (reflection) of teaching to colleagues who read it.

4. Fostering a culture of teaching
   - Portfolios can provide a rich and contextualized source of evidence about teaching achievements that can be used for a variety of purposes, including evaluation, improvement, summary of faculty careers, and defining “good teaching” in a department.

How Can Faculty Get Started?

Faculty can begin at any time to collect materials for their portfolios. At first, this process might entail simply saving relevant materials related to teaching so that they are readily accessible for review. At some point the faculty member will need to sort through the materials and decide which ones best represent his or her teaching accomplishments. Often this process is enhanced when faculty collaborate with each other as they build their portfolios.

CRLT offers campus-wide workshops on teaching and course portfolios, and we can bring a customized workshop to departments. The focus of the workshop is to help faculty develop a clear idea of what a portfolio is and what items it might include and to give faculty an opportunity to begin a reflective statement on teaching. When workshops are conducted in a department, faculty can begin to answer the question, “What is good teaching in our department?” CRLT also provides one-on-one consultations for individual faculty who are working on their portfolios and for units as they develop a systematic approach to portfolios.
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Faculty members should recognize which of the items which might be included in a teaching dossier would most effectively give a favorable impression of teaching competence and which might better be used for self-evaluation and improvement. The dossier should be compiled to make the best possible case for teaching effectiveness.

THE PRODUCTS OF GOOD TEACHING
1. Students’ scores on teacher-made or standardized tests, possibly before and after a course has been taken as evidence of learning.
2. Student laboratory workbooks and other kinds of workbooks or logs.
3. Student essays, creative work, and project or field-work reports.
4. Publications by students on course-related work.
5. A record of students who select and succeed in advanced courses of study in the field.
6. A record of students who elect another course with the same professor.
7. Evidence of effective supervision of Honors, Master’s or Ph.D. theses.
8. Setting up or running a successful internship program.
10. Documentary evidence of help given by the professor to students in securing employment.
11. Evidence of help given to colleagues on teaching improvement.

MATERIAL FROM ONESELF
Descriptive material on current and recent teaching responsibilities and practices.
12. List of course titles and numbers, unit values or credits, enrollments with brief elaboration.
13. List of course materials prepared for students.
14. Information on professor’s availability to students.
15. Report on identification of student difficulties and encouragement of student participation in courses or programs.
16. Description of how films, computers or other nonprint materials were used in teaching.
17. Steps taken to emphasize the interrelatedness and relevance of different kinds of learning.

Description of steps taken to evaluate and improve one’s teaching.
18. Maintaining a record of the changes resulting from self-evaluation.
19. Reading journals on improving teaching and attempting to implement acquired ideas.
20. Reviewing new teaching materials for possible application.
21. Exchanging course materials with a colleague from another institution.
22. Conducting research on one’s own teaching or course.
23. Becoming involved in an association or society concerned with the improvement of teaching and learning.

25. Using general support services such as the Education Resources Information Centre (ERIC) in improving one’s teaching.
26. Participating in seminars, workshops and professional meetings intended to improve teaching.
27. Participating in course or curriculum development.
28. Pursuing a line of research that contributes directly to teaching.
29. Preparing a textbook or other instructional materials.
30. Editing or contributing to a professional journal on teaching one’s subject.

INFORMATION FROM OTHERS
Students:
31. Student course and teaching evaluation data which suggest improvements or produce an overall rating of effectiveness or satisfaction.
32. Written comments from a student committee to evaluate courses and provide feedback.
33. Unstructured (and possibly unsolicited) written evaluations by students, including written comments on exams and letters received after a course has been completed.
34. Documented reports of satisfaction with out-of-class contacts.
35. Interview data collected from students after completion of a course.
36. Honors received from students, such as being elected “teacher of the year”.

Colleagues:
37. Statements from colleagues who have observed teaching either as members of a teaching team or as independent observers of a particular course, or who teach other sections of the same course.
38. Written comments from those who teach courses for which a particular course is a prerequisite.
39. Evaluation of contributions to course development and improvement.
40. Statements from colleagues from other institutions on such matters as how well students have been prepared for graduate studies.
41. Honors or recognition such as a distinguished teacher award or election to a committee on teaching.
42. Requests for advice or acknowledgement of advice received by a committee on teaching.

Other sources:
43. Statements about teaching achievements from administrators at one’s own institution or from other institutions.
44. Alumni ratings or other graduate feedback.
45. Comments from parents of students.
46. Reports from employers of students (e.g., in a work-study or “cooperative” program).
47. Invitations to teach for outside agencies.
48. Invitations to contribute to the teaching literature.
49. Other kinds of invitations based on one’s reputation as a teacher (for example, a media interview on a successful teaching innovation).

Appendix A

# Suggested Form for Peer Review of Undergraduate Teaching Based on Dossier Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>DOSSIER MATERIALS</th>
<th>SUGGESTED FOCUS IN EXAMINING DOSSIER MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What is the quality of materials used in teaching? | Course outline  
Syllabus  
Reading list  
Text used  
Study guide  
Description of non-print materials  
Hand-outs  
Problem sets  
Assignments | Are these materials current?  
Do they represent the best work in the field?  
Are they adequate and appropriate to course goals?  
Do they represent superficial or thorough coverage of course content? |
| Peer Reviewer’s Rating: Low | | |
| Comments: | | |
| 2. What kind of intellectual tasks were set by the teacher for the students (or did the teacher succeed in getting students to set for themselves). And how did the students perform? | Copies of graded examinations  
Examples of graded research papers  
Examples of teacher's feedback to students on written work  
Grade distribution  
Descriptions of student performances, e.g., class presentation, etc.  
Examples of completed assignments | What was the level of intellectual performance achieved by the students?  
What kind of work was given an A?, a B?, a C?  
Did the students learn what the department curriculum expected for this course?  
How adequately do the tests or assignments represent the kinds of student performance specified in the course objectives? |
| Peer Reviewer’s Rating: Low | | |
| Comments: | | |
| 3. How knowledgeable is this faculty member in subjects taught? | Evidence in teaching materials  
Record of attendance at regional or national meetings  
Record of colloquia or lectures given | Has the instructor kept in thoughtful contact with developments in his or her field?  
Is there evidence of acquaintance with the ideas and findings of other scholars? (This question addresses the scholarship necessary to good teaching. It is not concerned with scholarly research publication.) |
| Peer Reviewer’s Rating: Low | | |
| Comments: | | |
| 4. Has this faculty member assumed responsibilities related to the department's or University's teaching mission? | Record of service on department curriculum committee, honors program, advising board of teaching support service, special committees (e.g., to examine grading policies, admission standards, etc.)  
Description of activities in supervising graduate students learning to teach.  
Evidence of design of new courses. | Has he or she become a departmental or college citizen in regard to teaching responsibilities?  
Does this faculty member recognize problems that hinder good teaching and does he or she take a responsible part in trying to solve them?  
Is the involvement of the faculty member appropriate to his or her academic level? (e.g., assistant professors may sometimes become over-involved to the detriment of their scholarly and teaching activities.) |
| Peer Reviewer’s Rating: Low | | |
| Comments: | | |
| 5. To what extent is this faculty member trying to achieve excellence in teaching? | Factual statement of what activities the faculty member has engaged in to improve his or her teaching.  
Examples of questionnaires used for formative purposes.  
Examples of changes made on the basis of feedback. | Has he or she sought feedback about teaching quality, explored alternative teaching methods, made changes to increase student learning?  
Has he or she sought aid in trying new teaching ideas?  
Has he or she developed special teaching materials or participated in cooperative efforts aimed at upgrading teaching quality? |
| Peer Reviewer’s Rating: Low | | |
| Comments: | | |

GP LAZOVIK 1979  
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH  
Reprinted by permission.

Appendix B
Appendix D

Sample Solicitation Letter

♦ Non-Interdisciplinary Appointments
♦ Interdisciplinary Appointments
SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER

<date>

<name>
<title>
<department>
<institution>
<street>
<city, state, zip>

Dear Professor <Name>:

We are currently considering <candidate> for promotion to <action>. 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’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> for promotion.

(When applicable, please add the following: <candidate> has received an extension of <his/her> tenure clock by virtue of university policy. This policy states that the criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for faculty who do not have an extension to the tenure clock. We therefore request that this extension not be a factor in your letter of evaluation.)

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’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>? (in what capacity and for how long?)

2. What are your impressions about the quality, quantity, focus and scholarly impact of the writings?

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

4. How would you estimate <candidate’s> standing in relation to others in <his/her> peer group who are working in the same field?

5. How would you evaluate <candidate’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 at your institution?

[The following paragraph (word-for-word) should 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. As a public institution, legal considerations limit our ability to assure confidentiality, but it is our practice not to release external review letters unless required to do so by law.

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/fax>.

Sincerely,

<Name>
>Title

Enclosures
SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER

[date]

<name>
<title>
<department>
<institution>
<street>
<city, state, zip>

Dear Professor <Name>:

We are currently considering <candidate> for promotion to <action>. 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’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> for promotion.

(When applicable, please add the following: <candidate> has received an extension of <his/her> tenure clock by virtue of university policy. This policy states that the criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for faculty who do not have an extension to the tenure clock. We therefore request that this extension not be a factor in your letter of evaluation.)

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’s> written and scholarly contributions in relation to others of comparable experience in <his/her> field.

Dr. <candidate> is engaged in research that is interdisciplinary in nature. [He/she holds a joint appointment in the departments of <discipline> and <discipline>.] We invite your consideration of the interdisciplinary nature of <candidate’s> work in your review of his/her scholarly contributions.

We would appreciate your comments on the following issues:

1. How do you know <candidate>? (in what capacity and for how long?)
2. What are your impressions about the quality, quantity, focus and scholarly impact of the writings?
3. Which, if any, of the publications do you consider to be outstanding?
4. How would you estimate <candidate’s> standing in relation to others in <his/her> peer group who are working in the same field?

5. How would you evaluate <candidate’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 at your institution?

[The following paragraph (word-for-word) should 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. As a public institution, legal considerations limit our ability to assure confidentiality, but it is our practice not to release external review letters unless required to do so by law.

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/fax>.

Sincerely,

<Name>
>Title

Enclosures
Appendix E

Sample Paragraphs for Credentials of External Reviewers
A. ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF EXTERNAL REVIEWERS WHO PROVIDED LETTERS

Elsa Barkley Brown (Reviewer A.) Associate Professor of History and Women's Studies and Affiliate in African American Studies and American Studies, University of Maryland. Professor Brown is one of the most compelling historians exploring space, particularly in relation to African-American gender history. Among her many articles is "Mapping the terrain of Black Richmond" in the Journal of Urban History. (arm’s length – suggested by the department)

Nan Ellin (Reviewer B.) Associate Professor of Urban Design and Planning, College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning, at the University of Cincinnati. Professor Ellin is one of the most vigorous scholars at the cutting edge of architectural discourse. The author of the highly praised Post-modern Urbanism (published by Blackwell Press and reissued by Princeton Architectural Press) has helped to bridge the gap between architectural discourse and contemporary cultural criticism. Professor Ellin is co-author on several articles with the candidate. (not arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)

Kenneth Helphand (Reviewer C.) Professor of Landscape Architecture at the University of Oregon and Fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architecture. Professor Helphand is co-editor of Landscape Architecture, the profession’s leading peer-reviewed journal. He is one of the most respected scholars in the field of landscape architecture and author of two highly regarded works on vernacular landscape criticism. (arm’s length – suggested by the department)

Carl Marbury (Reviewer D.) Director of the Alabama Black History Project and Professor of the Humanities, Alabama State University. Professor Marbury is the resident historian of the Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site and was previously Distinguished University Professor at Tuskegee. As the Director of the Alabama Black History Project, he is at the helm of the most comprehensive project documenting African-American history in the state. He is a former president of Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical State University, Alabama’s black land-grant school under the Morrill Act. (arm’s length – suggested by the department)

Darrell Morrison (Reviewer E.) Professor of Landscape Architecture and former Dean of the School of Environmental Design at the University of Georgia. Professor Morrison was a founding editor of Landscape Journal, the foremost journal in the field. He is a Fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architects. Professor Morrison was the candidate’s mentor. (not arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)

Edward Pryce (Reviewer F.) Professor Emeritus of Landscape Architecture at Tuskegee University and the first African American to be named a Fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architects. He headed a team that authored the report that led to the Tuskegee campus designation as a national historic site. (arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)

Leslie Kanes Weisman (Reviewer G.) Professor Emeritus of Architecture, New Jersey Institute of Technology. Professor Weisman has been one of the pioneers of feminist criticism in architecture. She co-founded the Women's School of Planning and Architecture in 1984. Among her many publications is her book, Discrimination by Design: A feminist critique of the man-made environment. (arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)
B. ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FROM WHOM LETTERS WERE REQUESTED BUT WHO DECLINED AND THE REASONS FOR DECLINING

Gregory S. Alexander (Reviewer L.) Professor Alexander declined because of his limited knowledge of the candidate’s work. He is Professor of Law at Cornell Law School, where he teaches real property, property theory, and estate and trust law. He recently wrote a book on property theory that received an award for best law book of 2010 from the American Publishers Association. (arm’s length – suggested by the department)

Charles Donahue, Jr. (Reviewer J.) Professor Donahue declined because of a lack of time due to a family emergency. He is the Paul A. Freund Professor of Law at Harvard University, where he teaches property and legal history. He was previously a member of the University of Michigan Law School faculty. He is coauthor of a leading casebook on the law of real property and has written extensively about property and legal history. (arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)

Carol M. Rose (Reviewer K.) Professor Rose declined because she is out of the country. She is the Gordon Bradford Tweedy Professor of Law and Organization at Yale Law School, where she teaches property, contracts, environmental law, land use planning, and natural resources law. She was previously on the faculties of Stanford Law School, University of California at Berkeley, Northwestern, and University of Chicago. She is co-author of a casebook on property law and is a leading scholar on property theory. (arm’s length – suggested by the department)

Jeremy Waldron (Reviewer L.) Professor Waldron did not respond to numerous email requests. He is the Maurice and Hilda Friedman Professor Emeritus of Law at Columbia University where he taught courses in jurisprudence and legal theory. He was previously a member of faculty of the University of California, Berkeley School of Law. He is the author of a book on the theory of private property. Professor Waldon was the candidate’s thesis advisor. (not arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)
Appendix F

Student Evaluation Results Template
# Student Evaluation Results Template for Q1 and Q2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>* Teaching Role</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Enrollment/ Responses (numbers only)</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Instructor or Co-Instructor
Resources

♦ Faculty Handbook  (*Ann Arbor*)
♦ Board of Regents’ Bylaws
♦ Standard Practice Guide
Resources

♦ Faculty Handbook ♦

5.J  Status of Appointments When Academic Programs are Discontinued
6.A  General Principles
6.B  Criteria for Tenure
6.D  Extensions of the Probationary Period for Childbearing, Dependent Care, or Medical Leave
6.H  Joint Appointments
16.C  Leaves/Absences Related to Personal Circumstances
The University of Michigan Faculty Handbook

5.J Status of Appointments When Academic Programs are Discontinued

In the unlikely event of the discontinuance of an academic program, every effort will be made to assist in relocation and retraining of affected faculty. The recommended procedures are set forth below (bylaws 5.09 and 5.10; SPG 201.88 and 601.02).

5.J.1 Instructional Faculty

- Existing procedures for notice of non-reappointment for non-tenured instructional faculty should be followed when a program is scheduled for termination. The procedures are the same as those followed in the case of non-reappointment for any other reason.

- The maintenance of tenured faculty and of essential instructional and supporting services remains the highest priority of the University. If, however, at some future time, it should become necessary to release tenured faculty members within a program to be discontinued, every effort will be made to place tenured instructional faculty members in other suitable positions. This could include retraining if a reasonable period of retraining of the affected faculty member would qualify him or her for another position within the University. In cases where it is not possible to continue the appointment of a tenured faculty member, the procedures of bylaw 5.09 are available and severance pay will be provided if required under bylaw 5.10.

5.J.2 Other Faculty

Existing procedures for reduction in the work force will be followed for non-instructional faculty who are affected by the decision to close a program. See section 5.L “Reduction in Force/Termination.”
6.A General Principles

The University of Michigan believes that tenure is an essential part of the guarantee of academic freedom that is necessary for University-based intellectual life to flourish. The grant of indeterminate tenure to faculty members represents an enormous investment of University—and societal—resources, and those who receive this investment do so only after rigorous review which establishes that their scholarship, research, teaching, and service meet the highest standards and are congruent with the needs of the University.

Tenure is awarded only to faculty with appointments in the instructional track. Faculty on the clinical and research tracks are not eligible for tenure. Faculty members must hold their tenured positions in full recognition of the responsibilities they owe the University, as well as the responsibilities the University owes them.

Tenure for the instructional faculty at the University is defined and governed by bylaws 5.08 and 5.09. On the Ann Arbor campus, the administrative supervision of these bylaws rests in the Office of the Provost. At the UM-Flint and UM-Dearborn campuses, the chancellors oversee the tenure process on their respective campuses. However, procedures for review for tenure are among the most unit-specific of all the procedures affecting faculty members. Those who come to the University without tenure must recognize that the tenure procedures of their department, school or college, or other unit are the crucial starting point in this process. Accordingly, faculty should familiarize themselves with those procedures and obtain a copy of their unit’s written tenure guidelines from the dean. Some general principles and procedures, set forth below, do apply. (SPG 201.13) See also section 5.B "Criteria for Appointment and Promotion of Instructional Faculty."

Excellence: Faculty members are awarded tenure because they have distinguished themselves as scholars and teachers and show evidence that they will continue contributing at a very high level to scholarship, research, teaching, and service at the University of Michigan.

The Privilege and Responsibilities of Tenure: Faculty members who come to the University without tenure are not automatically entitled to tenure or to a review for tenure. Those who are offered tenured positions at the University, however, are entitled to its protections immediately upon arrival and must also assume the responsibilities of tenure. These responsibilities include the obligation to maintain high standards of teaching, scholarship, research, service, and professional conduct and to perform their responsibilities in accordance with University and other applicable policies and procedures.

The Protection of Tenure: The University safeguards academic freedom through its policy that no person who has been awarded tenure by the Regents or who has been employed by the University for a total of ten years at the rank of a full-time instructor or higher may, thereafter, be dismissed, demoted or recommended for terminal appointment without adequate cause and an opportunity for a review in accordance with bylaw 5.09, except pursuant to the Program Discontinuance Guidelines. See section 5.J "Status of Academic Appointments When Academic Programs are Discontinued,” and SPG 601.02.

Authority: Tenure is awarded only by the Board of Regents upon recommendation by the appropriate dean (and executive committee when applicable), by the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs (Ann Arbor campus only), by the chancellor (UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint campuses only), and by the president. A decision to award tenure is not official unless and until it has been approved by the Board of Regents (bylaw 5.08). The authority for periodic reviews and tenure reviews resides with the individual schools, colleges, and departments.
6.B Criteria for Tenure

After the appropriate probationary period (see section 6.C "Tenure Probationary Period"), tenure may be granted to those instructional faculty members whose professional accomplishments indicate that they will continue to serve with distinction in their appointed roles. Tenure is awarded to those who demonstrate excellent teaching, outstanding research and scholarship, and substantial additional service, each of which must be relevant to the goals and needs of the University, college and department. The award of tenure is based on the achievement of distinction in an area of learning and the prediction of continued eminence throughout the individual’s professional career.

Faculty Handbook: Tenure:
6.D Extensions of the Probationary Period for Childbearing, Dependent Care, or Medical Leave

6.D.1 Introduction

As described in more detail below, faculty who bear children, have dependent care responsibilities, or take medical leaves may apply to have time excluded from the countable years of service that constitute the relevant tenure probationary period and/or may take a period of modified duties. In some instances, the leave is automatic upon request by a faculty member while in other instances the leave is discretionary to be determined by the appropriate dean. Faculty are advised to check with their school or college for additional relevant policies. Faculty who benefit from one of these policies work throughout the tenure probationary period, carrying their usual range of responsibilities except during those periods when they may be on modified duties because of childbirth or on extended sick leave. See Chapter 16, "Leaves, Absences, Holidays, Vacations, and University Closures" and section 15.P, "Pregnancy and Family Care Benefits." Applications under these policies must be made to the dean of the relevant school or college, and implementation varies from unit to unit.

To promote University-wide consistency and record keeping, a copy of all requests and responses made under these policies must be forwarded to the Office of Academic Human Resources and, in the case of the UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint campuses, the chancellor.

6.D.2 Modified Duties for New Parents

To provide time to adjust to the demands of parenting newly born or adopted children, Standard Practice Guide 201.93 Modified Duties for New Parents entitles professorial faculty members who meet the criteria described below, upon request, to a period of modified duties without a reduction in salary:

- Gives birth to a child, or becomes a parent of a newly born or adopted child (or children in the case of a multiple birth or adoption of more than one child simultaneously) under the age of six,
- Takes significant and sustained care-giving responsibility for the child (or children) during the period for which modified duties are requested as a single parent or, where there are two parents, that is at least as time-consuming as the care-giving responsibility of the faculty member’s spouse or partner, and
- Begins the period of modified duties within twelve months of the date of the relevant birth or adoption.

The relevant dean (or his or her designate), in consultation with the eligible faculty member, will determine the ways in which the faculty member’s duties will be modified. At a minimum the relevant school or college will make arrangements that relieve the faculty member from direct teaching responsibilities for the period of modified duties.

For faculty members with significant direct clinical responsibilities or limited teaching obligations, other modifications will be provided appropriate to their circumstances. Faculty on modified duties status will typically be expected to fulfill their other professional responsibilities during the period of modified duties, including those responsibilities for which the faculty member is uniquely qualified, such as advising doctoral candidates. The relevant dean or department chair is responsible for making the necessary teaching arrangements (e.g., for replacement teaching during the period of modified duties or replacement clinical services).

Eligible faculty members may take one term of modified duties for each event that adds a child or children to his or her family. If both parents are employed in an eligible position at the University, each of them may take a period of modified duties for each event that adds a child or children to their family if both of them meet the other eligibility criteria. See also procedures <www.umich.edu/~hraa/procedures/spg201-93.htm>.
A period of modified duties does not, by itself, affect a faculty member's tenure probationary period. The relevant complementary policy is Standard Practice Guide 201.92 Tenure Probationary Period: Effects on Tenure Clock of Childbearing and Dependent Care Responsibilities, which provides guidelines about excluding time from the years of countable service that constitute the tenure probationary period due to the effects of pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions or due to the demands of dependent care.

### 6.D.3 Stopping the Tenure Clock for Childbearing or Dependent Care

In recognition of the effects that pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions can have upon the time and energy a woman can devote to her professional responsibilities, and thus on her ability to work at the pace or level expected to achieve tenure, a woman who bears one or more children during her tenure probationary period shall, upon written request to the relevant dean (in the case of the UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint campuses, the relevant provost) be granted an exclusion of one year for each event from the countable years of service that constitute the tenure probationary period to a maximum of two years. The exclusion for pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions is automatic on request for dependent care leave, but requests must be made prior to the initiation of the tenure review. See SPG 201.92.

Similarly, the demands of caring for dependents (such as children, including newly adopted children, ill or injured spouses or partners, or aging parents) may seriously affect the time and energy faculty can devote to their professional responsibilities during the tenure probationary period. In recognition of the difficulty of combining an academic career with significant dependent care demands, any faculty member (male or female) in these circumstances may, upon written request to the relevant dean (in the case of the UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint campuses, the provost), be granted an exclusion of two years from the countable years of service that constitute that individual’s tenure probationary period. The two-year exclusion for dependent care responsibility is not automatic. Requests must be made prior to the initiation of the tenure review. Under these policies, only two years may be excluded from the countable years of service that constitute an individual’s tenure probationary period at the University of Michigan, regardless of the combination of circumstances. See SPG 201.92.

With respect to caring for one or more newly born or adopted children under the dependent care section of this policy, during the year for which the exclusion is requested the faculty member must take significant and sustained care-giving responsibility for the child (or children) as a single parent or, where there are two parents, must take care-giving responsibility that is at least as time-consuming as the care-giving responsibility of the faculty member's spouse or partner.

A faculty member who benefits from this policy carries a usual range of responsibilities during the time the policy is in effect unless alternative arrangements have been made. Events that occur in the final year of a faculty member’s tenure probationary period may not be the basis for a request under this policy, and all requests under the policy must be made before the date that has been communicated to the faculty member as the date on which the unit will initiate the tenure review. See SPG 201.92.

Specific schools or colleges may have their own policies and programs regarding stopping the tenure clock for childbearing or dependent care, and faculty members are encouraged to contact the dean’s office for additional information on this topic.

### 6.D.4 Medical Leave

If an untenured faculty member suffers a serious illness and receives an approved extended sick leave, the faculty member may, upon written application to the relevant dean and with the approval of the provost, be granted an exclusion of that period of illness (up to one year) from the countable years of service that constitute that individual’s tenure probationary period. (SPG 201.13) For more information on sick leaves, see Chapter 16 “Leaves, Absences, Holidays, Vacations, and University Closures” and SPG 201.30-1.
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A joint appointment occurs when a faculty member holds appointments in more than one unit (for example: in two academic units; in an academic unit and a research unit; or in an academic unit and an administrative unit) (bylaw 5.11).

One of the University of Michigan's great strengths is its commitment to help faculty move across disciplinary boundaries to undertake innovative intellectual, scientific, and artistic endeavors and to create new knowledge. When a faculty member's sense of academic "home" crosses disciplinary boundaries, he or she may establish and maintain two or more academic bases.

Unless otherwise mutually agreed upon by all parties (the faculty member and all deans and chairs or directors of the appointing units), a primary unit should be identified for each faculty member. The policies and practices of that primary unit will usually govern any subsequent review process and decision regarding the awarding of tenure to that faculty member. In such cases, the tenure granted may be associated with only one of the appointments. In instances where tenure could be awarded in more than one unit, the policies and practices of each unit will usually govern the review processes and decisions regarding the awarding of tenure in each particular appointing unit. See SPG 201.13.

Year-to-year fluctuations in actual assignments across different appointing units do not change a unit’s responsibility for the faculty member’s tenured appointment fraction. That is, the fraction of the appointment that is formally tenured in any given unit is the portion of the appointment that is afforded the protections of tenure. See SPG 201.39-1. If tenure in a unit is associated with a partial appointment, the University is not obligated to increase the percentage of the individual's tenure-track appointment.

The Office of the Provost has developed a set of guidelines <www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/joint_appointments/Joint_Appts.html> for joint academic appointments, with considerable contributions from a group of associate deans and with input from the deans. The purpose of the guidelines is to assist deans, directors, and department chairs in helping faculty members who hold joint appointments to succeed and thrive as scholars at the University of Michigan.
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16.C.1 Introduction
The following section lists the various ways in which a member of the University of Michigan community may obtain time off work, either paid or unpaid, to meet the faculty member’s professional and personal needs. Because of the time commitment required of faculty members who teach, some of these leaves may not apply to them.

On the Ann Arbor campus, faculty absences must be reported to the faculty member’s department chair, dean, or director, and absences extending over more than three consecutive weeks must be reported to the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs. At the UM-Dearborn or the UM-Flint campuses, absences over more than three consecutive weeks are reported to the chancellor (bylaw 5.16). See also section 14.C “Salary Payments.”

16.C.2 Funeral Time
In the case of a death in the immediate family, the University provides up to three days paid time off from work to attend the funeral or memorial services and to make necessary arrangements. If additional time is needed, vacation time or excused absence without pay may be granted. When the death of an immediate family member occurs while a faculty member is on a scheduled vacation, up to three days of the faculty member's vacation time may be converted to funeral leave. "Immediate family" consists of an employee's spouse or other qualified adult; the son, daughter, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother, sister (or the spouse of any of them) of the employee, the employee's spouse/other qualified adult, or any other related person living in the employee's household (SPG 201.03).

16.C.3 Family Care Time Off
Faculty are eligible to receive sick leave income for up to three calendar weeks per year to care for a family member whose condition meets the eligibility criteria included in Standard Practice Guide 201.11-1 Sick Leave Plan – Academic Appointments. These conditions include time off to care for a family member who needs care because of incapacity caused or contributed to by pregnancy, miscarriage, abortion, or childbirth. Short-term sick time pay is also available for employees who are unable to work because they are caring for their newly born, newly adopted or newly fostered child. Staff members may use sick time pay for this purpose only during the year following the child's birth or arrival in the home. A "family member" is defined as the employee's spouse or partner with whom the employee shares living accommodations and expenses; the child, sibling, parent, grandparent or other related individual whose care is the responsibility of the staff member, spouse or partner. (SPG 201.11-0) See also section 15.P “Pregnancy and Family Care Benefits.”

16.C.4 Family and Medical Leave Act
The Family and Medical Leave Act allows eligible employees up to twelve weeks of job-protected leave per year, provides for continuance of the employee's pre-existing health, dental and vision coverage during this leave period, and restores the employee to the same or an equivalent position at the conclusion of the designated leave. The FMLA applies to all employees with at least one year of service who worked at least 1250 hours in the previous twelve months.

Regular and supplemental faculty and staff are covered by the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) for the following kinds of unpaid leaves of absence: child care for the birth, adoption, and foster care placement of a child; personal medical, for a faculty member's own personal illness; and family medical, for the serious illness of a family member (see SPG 201.11-0 for definitions). Before taking an unpaid FMLA leave, the faculty member must use up all available sick time and vacation time (if vacation plan participation is appropriate).
The University will pay the monthly premiums for health insurance of a faculty member who has been approved for a leave of absence without pay under the provisions of the Family and Medical Leave Act, provided the faculty member is already eligible to participate in the health insurance plans. Any required reimbursement of the faculty member’s portion of the health insurance premiums is processed after the faculty member returns to work following the leave. Benefits and leave of absence end dates for supplemental faculty may not extend past the individual's appointment end date.

16.C.5 Jury and Witness Service

The University’s policy is that no regular employee shall sustain a loss of regular compensation when they are called for jury duty or to testify at the order of a court or other government agency or at the request of the University. Specific regulations about compensation for this service and for related travel expenses may be obtained from departmental offices. Also see SPG 201.29 Jury and Witness Pay.

16.C.6 Leaves of Absence without Salary for Personal Reasons (Including Child Care Leaves)

Excused absences without pay for longer than 21 consecutive calendar days must be covered by a leave of absence. Leaves of absence without salary are granted for professional circumstances (see section 16.B.6 “Leaves of Absence without Salary for Personal Reasons (Including Child Care Leaves) or for personal circumstances, including child-care, disability, maternity, medical needs, military service, and a variety of other personal circumstances. (SPG 201.30-1)

The president or his or her designated representative may grant leaves of absence without salary on recommendation by the dean or director to members of the instructional faculty for periods of up to one year, and to archivists, curators, librarians, and research track faculty. Only the Board of Regents may grant leaves exceeding one year in duration and extensions of leaves beyond one year for instructional faculty when an appropriate request is made on recommendation by the department head, the dean or director, and the president. Leaves of absence for instructional faculty will be reported monthly to the Board of Regents.

For information about benefit coverage during a leave, refer to the Benefits website at http://benefits.umich.edu/events/leaves.html. Faculty and staff who meet the criteria for a leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) are entitled to receive University contributions toward medical and dental premiums. For more information, see Leaves [http://benefits.umich.edu/events/leaves.html] on the University Human Resources website.

16.C.7 Military Leave

Leaves of absence without salary for military service may be given to a person who is called up as a member of the National Guard or Reserve. Faculty members should contact the appropriate dean or director for more information. (SPG 201.30-1) The University complies with the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA)

16.C.8 Military Reserve Duty

All regular faculty and staff are granted up to 15 working days off in any one calendar year without loss of their regular compensation or any loss of their fringe benefits in order to participate in Military Reserve or National Guard Training Programs or for service required as a result of civil disorder or other emergency. The faculty member’s regular University compensation will be reduced by the amount of base military pay, if any, received for such services. On request, faculty may choose to use available vacation time to allow them to receive their full University pay. (SPG 201.33)
16.C.9 Sick Leave

The University wishes to minimize the loss of compensation to faculty when illness, injury, disability or preventive medical care makes absence from the performance of duty unavoidable. Consistent with its needs and requirements, the University grants sick leave to eligible members of the faculty when they make application on these grounds. The duties of the individual on sick leave are to be provided for without additional funding from the staff member's school or college.

Members of the faculty who become incapacitated by sickness or accident are eligible for sick leave for periods of time and at rates of compensation that vary according to the individual's length of service with the University and his or her rank. Regular and supplemental instructional faculty members are eligible for short-term sick leave at their regular salary during incapacity not to exceed three calendar weeks annually. Regular faculty members with service of two years or more are eligible for extended sick leave for one-half of a University-year at regular salary and one-half of a University-year at one-half regular salary. As an alternative, the faculty member may opt to receive sick leave income paid during incapacity at the full rate of the faculty member's academic year annual salary or twelve-month salary for a time not to exceed three-quarters the length of his or her annual appointment (up to a total of 6 3/4 months for faculty who hold University-year appointments or up to a total of 9 months for faculty who hold 12-month appointments).

Regular associate and full professors, associate and full research scientists and research professors, and senior associate librarians and archivists, librarians, and curators with ten years of service or more are eligible for extended sick leave for one University-year at regular salary and for an additional University-year at one-half regular salary. As an alternative, the faculty member may opt to receive sick leave income paid during incapacity at the full rate of the faculty member's academic year annual salary or twelve-month salary for a time not to exceed one length plus one-half the length of his or her annual appointment (up to a total of 13 1/2 months for faculty who hold University-year appointments or up to a total of 18 months for faculty who hold 12-month appointments).

The maximum amount of sick leave available for any one continuous illness or injury is three weeks of short-term sick leave plus the faculty member's extended sick leave benefits minus any short-term sick leave taken during the one year short-term sick leave period or the five year extended sick leave period in effect at the time the illness or injury occurs (SPG 201.11-1).
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**Sec. 5.01. Definitions (revised October 2003)**

As used in these bylaws:

1. The term *faculty* shall include members of the teaching and research staff together with the executive officers, the directors of various teaching, research, and library units, research associates, curators, and persons with similar duties.

2. The term *professorial staff* shall include professors, associate professors, and assistant professors.

3. The term *governing faculty*, when used in connection with a school or college, shall include those members of the school or college who are professors, associate professors, and assistant professors. The governing faculty shall include instructors and lecturers who hold appointments of one-half time or more; provided, however, that such instructors and lecturers may vote at faculty meetings only if they have held appointments for one or more years and are authorized to vote by a majority of the professorial staff of the appropriate school or college. The governing faculty may include clinical professors, clinical associate professors, clinical assistant professors, research scientists, associate research scientists, assistant research scientists, research investigators, research professors, research associate professors, and research assistant professors when authorized by, and in accordance with, the policies and bylaws of the appropriate school or college.

4. The term *teaching staff* shall include professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, lecturers, and teaching fellows.

5. The terms *teaching fellow, teaching associate, teaching assistant, student assistant, research assistant, technical assistant, laboratory assistant, and assistant* shall be used to designate junior appointees who participate in the processes of teaching and research but do not possess faculty rank. Students in these classifications shall have student status.
6. The term university year, as used in connection with appointments of members of the faculty and other personnel, contains any two terms in the calendar, as defined for the year in question. Faculty members are expected to participate in orientation, registration, and commencement.

7. 

Sec. 5.02. Governing Bodies in Schools and Colleges (revised January 1993)

In each school, college, or degree granting division of the university, including those at the University of Michigan-Dearborn and at the University of Michigan-Flint, the governing faculty shall be in charge of the affairs of the school, college, or division, except as delegated to the executive committee, if any, and except that in the School of Graduate Studies the governing body shall be the executive board, and in the Medical School shall be the executive faculty.

Sec. 5.03. Powers and Duties of the Governing Faculties

The faculty of each school and college shall from time to time recommend to the board for approval such regulations as are not included within these bylaws and which are pertinent to its structure and major operating procedures, such as departmental organization, requirements for admission and graduation, and other educational matters, the determination of which is within the peculiar competence of the faculties of the several schools and colleges. All such recommendations when approved by the board shall be recorded in the Proceedings of the Board of Regents. Subject to the ultimate authority of the board, the faculty of each school and college is also vested with plenary powers to make rules and regulations concerning other matters such as grading regulations, class attendance, committee organization and related internal matters. All such regulations shall be recorded in the minute books of the adopting authority and filed with the secretary of the university.

Each faculty shall provide suitable instruction for the students enrolled in its school or college. Each faculty shall recommend to the board students under its jurisdiction who qualify for university degrees. It shall, subject to the board, possess such other powers as are necessary to the performance of its duties.

Sec. 5.04. Faculty Procedure

Each faculty shall adopt rules for its own government and procedure and shall appoint a secretary, define the secretary's duties, and keep a record of faculty action.

In the absence of specific rules to the contrary, the rules of parliamentary procedure as described in Robert's Rules of Order shall be followed by school and college faculties, committees, boards, and other deliberative bodies.

Sec. 5.05. Faculty Communications to the Board

Each faculty shall submit its communications to the board in writing through its dean, and at the University of Michigan-Dearborn and the University of Michigan-Flint through the chancellor, and through the president of the university. Each dean shall endorse faculty communications, making appropriate explanatory statements as needed. (See also Sec. 1.08.)

Sec. 5.06. The Deans and Executive Committees

The dean or director, or administrative head of a school, college, or department of instruction or research shall be appointed by the board on recommendation by the president to act as executive officer of the school, college, or department.

If an executive committee has been created by the board for the school, college, or department, the dean, director, or head shall be assisted by the executive committee of which he or she shall be ex officio the chair. The executive committee in addition to assisting with administrative functions shall be charged with the duties of investigating and formulating educational and instructional policies for consideration by the faculty and shall act for the faculty in matters of budgets, promotions, and appointments.

Sec. 5.07. Administrative Officers of Other University Units (revised July 1997)

Administrative officers of units other than those covered by Sec. 5.06 shall be appointed by the board on recommendation by the president. They shall perform such administrative duties as are prescribed by the appropriate university authorities. Appointments to such administrative positions are without tenure and may be terminated upon the request of the appointee for relief from administrative duties or by the action of the board.
Sec. 5.08. Appointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Resignation of the Staff (revised February 2012)

1. Members of the tenured professorial staff shall be appointed by the board on recommendation by the appropriate dean or executive committee, the provost, and at the University of Michigan-Dearborn or the University of Michigan-Flint by the chancellor, and by the president. Unless otherwise provided by specific action by the board, professors and associate professors shall be appointed on indeterminate tenure. The annual budget as approved by the board shall be deemed the record of continuance of service for the ensuing year of all persons on the professorial staff.

2. Assistant professors and all other nontenured members of the teaching staff shall be appointed by the president on recommendation by the dean and executive committee, and at the University of Michigan-Dearborn or the University of Michigan-Flint by the chancellor. Assistant professors, instructors, and lecturers shall be appointed for terms of up to four years, as is in each case specifically designated in the terms of the appointment. Whenever the term of appointment to assistant professor, instructor, or lecturer is not specified, it shall be for one year only. Other teaching appointments shall be for not more than one year. The annual budget as approved by the board shall be deemed the record of continuance of service for the ensuing year for all persons on the teaching staff. All such appointments shall be reported monthly to the board.

3. Unless specifically provided otherwise by these bylaws, all other members of the staff of the university shall be appointed by the president, on recommendation by the appropriate administrative officer for the fiscal year only.

4. All promotions to tenured teaching positions shall be made by the board on recommendation by the chair of the department, the dean, the executive committee, the provost, and at the University of Michigan-Dearborn or the University of Michigan-Flint by the chancellor and the president. All promotions to nontenured teaching staff shall be made by the president on recommendation by the appropriate administrative officer and shall be reported to the board in the same manner as an original appointment in this class. All such changes for other members of the staff shall be made by the president on recommendation by the appropriate administrative officer or agency.

5. All resignations of teaching staff shall be reported to the board monthly.

6. Appointments to positions paid in whole or in part from grants or contracts for limited periods of time shall be subject to the following provisions in the event of cessation of these funds:

   a. In case of persons previously holding full-time or part-time positions paid from general university funds the person shall be restored to this appointment status within the department, either with tenure or for the remainder of the term of appointment, at the appropriate departmental salary.

   b. In case of persons brought to the university for the performance of duties payable from limited term funds, both service and salary shall be terminated.

Nothing in these regulations shall prohibit a department from recommending a new appointee to a tenure grade within the faculty and assigning the new appointee immediately to duties payable from limited term funds. When the limited term funds are no longer available, the department concerned shall be responsible for providing further tenure of duties and salary.

Sec. 5.09. Procedures in Cases of Dismissal, Demotion, or Terminal Appointment (revised April 2011)

1. Applicability. The procedures prescribed in this section shall be followed (a) before recommendation is made to the Board of Regents of dismissal or demotion of a tenured member of the university teaching staff or of any member of the teaching staff during the term for which any member of the teaching staff is appointed; or (b) before recommendation is made to the Board of Regents of dismissal, demotion, or terminal appointment of a teaching staff member holding appointments with the university for a total of ten years in the rank of full-time instructor or higher. Subject to pursuing these procedures, a recommendation of dismissal, demotion, or terminal appointment may be made for causes accepted by university usage, properly connected with the improvement and efficiency of the faculty, and consistent with the character of the tenure involved.
2. \textit{Initiation of Proceedings}. Proceedings which may result in a recommendation of dismissal, demotion, or terminal appointment may be initiated by the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs or by the executive authority (dean, director, or executive committee) of the school, college, or other unit (hereinafter called the administrative unit) in which the affected faculty member is employed. In exceptional cases which, in the judgment of the president, threaten direct and immediate injury to the public reputation or the essential functions of the university, the president may direct that the affected faculty member be relieved of some or all of his or her university duties and responsibilities, without prejudice and without loss of compensation, pending the final disposition of the case.

3. \textit{Proceedings Dependent on Classification of Case}. Cases involving matters concerning primarily the administrative unit in which the affected faculty member is employed shall be subject to the procedures provided for by subsection 4 of this section. Cases involving matters of general university concern shall be subject to the procedures provided for by subsection 5 of this section. The provost and executive vice president for academic affairs, before initiating action with respect to a faculty member, shall notify the president, SACUA, and the executive authority of the administrative unit. The president, after consulting with SACUA and the executive authority of the administrative unit, shall determine whether the case shall be handled under subsection 4 or subsection 5 of this section. The executive authority of an administrative unit, before initiating action with respect to a faculty member, shall notify the president and SACUA, and the president, after consulting with SACUA, shall determine whether the case shall be handled under subsection 4 or subsection 5 of this section. The president's determination shall be communicated in writing to SACUA and the executive authority of the administrative unit.

4. \textit{Procedure in Cases Referred to the Executive Authority of the School or College.}

a. Upon referral by the president of a case to the executive authority of an administrative unit, the executive authority shall promptly give written notice thereof to the faculty member affected and to SACUA. The notice shall state with reasonable particularity the charges which the executive authority proposes to investigate and shall advise the faculty member that the faculty member may, upon making written request not more than ten days after receipt of the notice, have the right to a hearing.

b. The executive authority shall promptly investigate a case referred to it; and, if the faculty member has requested a hearing, shall provide for a hearing either (1) before the executive committee of the administrative unit or (2) before a special ad hoc faculty committee appointed by the executive authority with the approval of the executive committee or the governing faculty of the administrative unit. The affected faculty member may (1) have an adviser of the faculty member's own choosing who may act as counsel; (2) be present at all sessions of the hearing committee at which evidence is received or argument is heard; (3) call, examine, and cross examine witnesses; and (4) examine all documentary evidence received by the hearing committee. A full stenographic record of the hearing shall be taken, and the hearing committee shall, with reasonable promptness, file a written report on the case, together with a transcript of the record of the hearing, with the executive head of the administrative unit, SACUA, and the president. The report shall contain the hearing committee's conclusions and recommendations and the reasons therefor. If dismissal, demotion, or terminal appointment is recommended, the report shall contain a specific statement of the deficiencies or acts of misconduct on which the recommendation is based, and a copy of the report shall be delivered to the faculty member.

c. If the hearing committee recommends that adverse action be taken against the faculty member, the executive authority of the administrative unit, before considering the matter further, shall advise the faculty member in writing that the faculty member may have a review of the case by the standing subcommittee on tenure appointed by the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs as provided in subparagraph (d) of this subsection. If the hearing committee recommends that adverse action should not be taken against the affected faculty member, but the executive head of the school or college, upon review of the hearing committee's report and the record, disagrees with its recommendation and concludes that the executive head of the school or college should recommend adverse action against the faculty member, the executive head of the school or college shall notify the faculty member in writing of his or her recommendation, and with reasonable particularity of the reasons therefor, and shall advise the faculty member that the faculty member may have a review of the case as provided in subparagraph (d) of this subsection.
d. The request of the faculty member for review of the faculty member's case by the review committee shall be presented in writing to the chair or secretary of SACUA within ten days after receipt by the faculty member of the notice from the executive head or authority of the administrative unit that adverse action against the faculty member has been recommended. The request for review shall be referred to the standing Subcommittee on Tenure appointed by SACUA and designated by it as the review committee. The review committee shall promptly, but upon not less than ten days' written notice to the faculty member and to the executive head of the administrative unit, conduct a hearing in the matter, of which a full written record shall be taken. The review committee shall review the record, reports, and recommendations transmitted by the hearing committee and may in addition receive new evidence. The faculty member, either in person or through a representative or both, and the executive head of the administrative unit shall have the right to appear, to comment on the proceeding before the hearing committee and on its findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and to examine and rebut any new evidence received by the review committee. A full record shall be kept of the review proceeding.

e. In conducting its review of the case, the review committee shall take account of all relevant factors, including consideration of the questions (1) whether the hearing committee observed the procedure prescribed in this subsection, (2) whether the hearing committee accorded a fair hearing, (3) whether the deficiencies or acts of misconduct on which the hearing committee's recommendations are based are related to the charges stated in the first instance as the basis for investigation, (4) whether the proceeding as it developed before the hearing committee involves matters of general university concern, and (5) whether the weight of the evidence, as it appears in the record and as supplemented by any further evidence by the review committee, supports the hearing committee's findings and recommendations. In determining what its recommendation shall be, the review committee shall be free to make any recommendation appropriate to its findings and conclusions respecting either the procedural or meritorious aspects of the case.

f. Within thirty days following its hearing, the review committee shall file a written report with the affected faculty member, the executive head of the administrative unit, the president, and SACUA. The report shall contain the committee's conclusions, recommendations, and the reasons therefor. There shall be filed with the report a transcript of the record of the hearing conducted by the review committee.

g. The faculty member and SACUA may, within ten days after receiving the review committee's report, file written comments thereon with the president and, in the case of the faculty member, with the executive head of the administrative unit. Within twenty days after it receives the hearing committee's report, the executive authority of the administrative unit shall notify the president of its final recommendations in the case.

h. The president shall thereafter review the record in the case and shall formulate his or her own recommendations and the reasons therefor. The affected faculty member and SACUA shall be furnished copies of the president's recommendations and may, within ten days after receiving the same, submit to the president written comments respecting the recommendations. The full record of the case, including the recommendations of the president and any comments by the affected faculty member or SACUA, shall then be transmitted by the president to the board for final action.

5. Procedure in Cases Referred to SACUA

a. Upon referral of a case by the president to SACUA, the committee shall designate its standing Subcommittee on Tenure to serve as a hearing committee and shall refer the case to it for hearing. The hearing committee shall promptly give written notice to the faculty member affected. The notice shall state with reasonable particularity the charges (as prepared by the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs) which the committee proposes to investigate, and shall advise the faculty member that the faculty member may, upon making written request not later than ten days after receipt of the notice, have the right to a hearing before the committee.

a. The hearing committee shall promptly investigate a case referred to it, and may call upon any member of the university faculty or staff for relevant information. The provost and executive vice president for academic affairs, or a representative, may be present at all meetings of the committee, and may present such evidence as the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs
deems appropriate. The executive authority of the administrative unit in which the affected faculty member is employed may be present or represented at all meetings of the committee, and if it wishes to make any recommendations, shall make them to the committee prior to the conclusion of the committee’s investigation, whereupon such recommendations shall become a part of the committee’s record in the case. If the affected faculty member requests a hearing before the committee, a full stenographic record of the hearing shall be taken. The affected faculty member may (1) have an adviser of the faculty member’s own choosing who may act as counsel; (2) be present at all sessions of the hearing committee at which evidence is received or argument is heard; (3) call, examine, and cross examine witnesses; and (4) examine all documentary evidence received by the hearing committee.

b. Within a reasonable period of time after the referral of the case to the hearing committee, the committee shall file a written report with SACUA. The report shall contain the committee’s conclusions, recommendations, and the reasons therefor. If dismissal, demotion, or terminal appointment is recommended, the report shall contain a specific statement of the conduct on which the recommendation is based. There shall be filed with the report the complete written record in the case, including the recommendations, if any, made to the committee by the executive authority of the school or college and a transcript of the record of any hearings conducted by the committee.

c. If the committee recommends that adverse action be taken against the faculty member, SACUA shall advise the faculty member affected that the faculty member may request the Senate Advisory Committee to review the proceeding conducted by the hearing committee. The faculty member’s request for a review shall be presented in writing to the chair or secretary of SACUA within ten days thereafter. Upon receipt of this request SACUA may in its discretion conduct a hearing for the purpose of determining whether the hearing committee granted a fair hearing and followed the procedure prescribed by this subsection. If such a review hearing is granted, the faculty member, either in person or through a representative or both, shall have the right to appear and to comment on the proceeding before the hearing committee. A full record shall be kept of the review proceeding.

d. If SACUA determines that the hearing committee failed to grant a fair hearing or to follow the prescribed procedure, it shall set aside the committee’s findings and conclusions and remand the case to the committee for a new hearing in accordance with the procedure prescribed by this subsection. A written report of the action taken by SACUA, together with the record of its review proceeding, shall be filed with the affected faculty member, the executive head of the administrative unit, the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs, and the president.

e. If the hearing committee recommends that adverse action should not be taken against the affected faculty member, or if it recommends that adverse action be taken and the affected faculty member does not request a review by SACUA, or if in case a review is requested and granted it is determined that the hearing committee granted a fair hearing and followed the prescribed procedures, SACUA shall file the hearing committee’s report and recommendations together with the complete written record in the case with the affected faculty member, the president, the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs, and the executive authority of the administrative unit. In filing the report and record with the president, SACUA may also include its comments on the hearing committee’s findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The affected faculty member, the executive authority of the administrative unit, and the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs may, within ten days after receiving copies of the hearing committee’s report and the record, file written comments with the president.

f. The president shall thereafter review the record in the case and shall formulate his or her own recommendations and the reasons therefor. The affected faculty member and SACUA shall be furnished copies of the president’s recommendations and may, within ten days after receiving the same, submit to the president written comments respecting the recommendations. The full record of the case, including the recommendations of the president and any comments by the affected faculty member or SACUA, shall then be transmitted by the president to the board for final action.
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Rules Concerning Regents’ Bylaw 5.09, Tenure, Tenure Review, and Joint or Partial Tenure Appointments

This SPG incorporates former SPG 201.13, *Rules concerning acquiring the protection of Regents’ Bylaw 5.09 by accumulating years of Service;* SPG 201.21, *Appointments Specifically Designated “Without Tenure;”* SPG 201.39-1, *Principles and Practices Governing Tenure for Faculty Members with Divided or Partial Appointments;* and SPG 201.50, *Guidelines Related to Tenure Reviews and Reappointment Reviews.*

Tenure is granted to certain eligible faculty members at the ranks of associate professor and professor by the Regents of the University upon recommendation of the appropriate departmental chair, dean, executive committee, the provost, and at the University of Michigan-Dearborn and the University of Michigan-Flint by the chancellor, and by the president (Regents’ Bylaw 5.08[4]).

Unless otherwise specified, a faculty member with tenure is presumed to hold tenure in his or her department, if the school or college is so organized; in the school or college; and in the University of Michigan, except pursuant to Regents’ Bylaws 5.08 and 5.09 or the Program Discontinuance Guidelines. Faculty rights conferred by the university with respect to tenure are described in Regents’ Bylaws 5.08 and 5.09 and the Program Discontinuance Guidelines. The schools and colleges maintain information about the tenure status of their faculty.

Because the university is large, decentralized, and heterogeneous, the views and needs of its various schools and colleges differ; therefore, considerable latitude in procedures and criteria for tenure and reappointment review is desirable. For example, upon recommendation of the appropriate faculty, each school or college decides on its own presumptive time to tenure review, within the parameters set by Regents’ Bylaw 5.09. While recognizing the diversity of academic and educational cultures in an institution as complex as the university, and the need for individual schools and colleges to adopt and articulate promotion and tenure guidelines that work for them, it is also important for the university to articulate an institution-wide set of norms and expectations. The purpose of this policy is to articulate those university-wide rules and practices, to which school and college procedures must align.

1. **Rules Concerning Regents’ Bylaw 5.08, Regents’ Bylaw 5.09, and SPG 601.02 (Program Discontinuance Guidelines)**

   Regents’ Bylaw 5.09 prescribes procedures that must be followed before certain members of the faculty may be dismissed or demoted. A faculty member1 acquires a right to these procedures when the Board of Regents awards indeterminate tenure to him or her or when he or she has accumulated ten years of full-time regular instructional faculty appointments at the University of Michigan in the rank of instructor or higher,2 under the conditions explained in this policy and other applicable university policies.

   As described more fully below, the university’s policy on notice of non-reappointment3 effectively shortens this ten-year requirement to approximately nine years.

   Year-to-year fluctuations in actual assignments across different appointing schools and colleges do not change the school or college’s responsibility for the fractional appointment(s) a faculty member holds “with tenure,” although such assignment shifts may affect the source of funds used to support that faculty member’s salary. If an appointing school or college that has awarded tenure to a faculty member subsequently agrees with the faculty member to a reduction in his or her appointment, upon request by the faculty member the appointing school or college must reestablish the appointment at the original fractional level. The only circumstances under which a school or college may choose not to reestablish the tenured faculty member’s appointment at the original fractional level are: when the usual understanding has been modified through mutual agreement, pursuant to the Program Discontinuance Guidelines or through actions taken in accordance with Regents’ Bylaws 5.08 or 5.09.

II. University Policies Governing Tenure and Tenure Review
A. Counting of Time Toward the Acquisition of Regents’ Bylaw 5.09 Protections

The rules below specify the conditions under which the university counts a term of appointment toward the ten years needed to acquire the protections of Bylaw 5.09 by the accumulation of years of service. Hence, they set an outer limit on how long a school or college may use the services of certain members of the instructional faculty without giving them notice of non-reappointment or recommending them for tenure. The rules in this section (ILA) became effective on July 1, 1986, but do not apply to persons holding associate and full professor appointments that were specifically designated “without tenure” before this date.

The time a faculty member spends in a university appointment will be counted toward the acquisition of the protections of Regents’ Bylaw 5.09 by the accumulation of years of service if, and only if, each of the conditions below for title, rank, appointment fraction, and service are met:

Title and Rank. The appointment of a tenure-track faculty member consists of a regular instructional faculty appointment at the rank of instructor or higher. This includes any appointment as a regular instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, including such appointments designated as “without tenure.” It does not include lecturer appointments or adjunct, clinical, research, or visiting appointments.

Appointment Fraction. The appointment must be “full-time” within the university. Within the context of Bylaw 5.09, “full-time” means an academic year or academic term appointment fraction of 80% or more, even if the total fraction is split between two or more appointments. For the 80% or more total to be achieved through two or more concurrent appointments, each of the appointments must satisfy the title and rank conditions above, and the service conditions below.

Service. The appointment must be spent in one or more of the activities described below:

- in residence at the University of Michigan; or
- on paid duty off-campus (SPG 201.90); or
- on Scholarly Activity Leave (SPG 201.30-4) for one year or less, or for a longer period but only if the faculty member and the school or college agree in writing to an exception to this provision at the time the leave is granted and such exception is approved in writing by the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs on the Ann Arbor campus, or by the provost and vice chancellor for academic affairs on the Dearborn or Flint campus; or
- on other forms of paid or unpaid leave, unless the faculty member and the school or college agree in writing when the leave is granted that the time the faculty member will be on leave will not count toward the acquisition of the protections of Regents’ Bylaw 5.09 and that such agreement is approved in writing by the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs on the Ann Arbor campus, or by the provost and vice chancellor for academic affairs on the Dearborn or Flint campus.

Changes in Appointment or Service. With the exceptions specified below, any change in title, rank, appointment fraction, or service that stops or starts the accumulation of years of service relevant to Bylaw 5.09 requires the prior written approval of the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs on the Ann Arbor campus, or by the provost and vice chancellor for academic affairs on the Dearborn or Flint campus. The only exceptions are those pertaining to childbirth and dependent care described in SPG 201.92 Tenure Probationary Period: Effects on Tenure Clock of Childbearing and Dependent Care Responsibilities; notice to the provost that such exclusions have been approved is required, but prior written approval of the provost is not necessary.

B. Timing of Tenure Reviews

Each school and college must specify a probationary period with a presumptive time at which a faculty member will be considered for tenure. This period may be shorter than the time specified by Bylaw 5.09 but, under that Bylaw, tenure review must be initiated no later than the end of the first semester of the faculty member’s fifth year of university appointments, with the expectation that one (and only one) additional year of employment will be available if tenure is denied.

At the time of hiring, individual faculty should be informed in writing of the school or college’s presumptive time to tenure and of the specific year in which the individual will be considered. The school or college should inform all untenured faculty annually of the year in which they individually will be reviewed for tenure, or make
such information easily available. If there is a change in the expected timing for any reason, that change should be communicated to the affected faculty member as soon as possible.

The chair or dean or a duly authorized elected or appointed faculty committee may, where consistent with the standards of the school or college, initiate a tenure review at any time before or after the school’s presumptive tenure review year. A review that departs from the school’s presumptive clock requires the specific concurrence of the faculty member. The criteria for tenure do not vary when a review is scheduled at some time other than the presumptive time.

A faculty member may request a tenure review at any time, but the decision to conduct such a review is within the discretion of the chair or dean and must be made, where applicable, in accordance with the policy of the school or college, as well as consistently with the notice requirements of SPG 201.88.

The provost’s office expects that a school or college will produce a complete casebook, including letters from external reviewers, and forward those materials to the provost for review (a) whenever the school or college is recommending that tenure be granted, (b) whenever the school or college has reached a final decision that tenure will not be recommended, or (c) whenever the school or college is recommending that a tenured faculty member be promoted to full professor. If the school or college dean seeks an exception to this policy (for example, wishes to forward a review that does not include external letters), that exception must be discussed with the provost prior to October 31 of the penultimate year of the faculty member’s probationary period.

In cases of a negative tenure decision, it is the University’s expectation that, except in unusual circumstances, the faculty member will be given a terminal year following the year in which the negative decision is reached. Non-reappointment notification deadlines are specified in SPG 201.88 Notice of Non-reappointment. If a school or college decides to dismiss a tenure-track faculty member without a tenure review, the faculty member should be informed in writing by October 31 of the penultimate year of the school or college’s probationary period. If an untenured faculty member is in his or her penultimate year and notice consistent with SPG 201.88 is not given, the school or college is obliged to conduct a tenure review during that year (and no later than the ninth year of the faculty member’s University tenure-track appointments).

C. Guidelines regarding University of Michigan Policies that Govern Time to Tenure Review (“The Tenure Clock”) and Related Matters” (Ann Arbor Campus)

To help clarify university policies in the area of tenure review—with a focus on "the tenure clock"—the office of the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs has developed Guidelines on Tenure Review Timing. These guidelines are available at http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/tenure_review/policies.html.

The office of the provost strongly encourages each school and college to develop and make known its own tenure procedures that are consistent with these guidelines.

D. Procedures to be Followed in Making Recommendations to Grant or Deny Tenure and to Reappoint or Not Reappoint Regular Instructional Staff Members with the Rank of Full-time12 Instructor or Higher

The common principles articulated below include University requirements, as well as “best practices” that may be adopted by the schools and colleges. Unless so specified, they are not mandatory but are intended to be adapted to the needs of each school and college in the creation of its own tenure procedures.

Schools and colleges must conduct an interim performance review of untenured faculty no later than the third year of the probationary period. If the tenure probationary period established by the school or college is longer than seven years, a second less formal review should be conducted in the fifth or sixth year to provide feedback about progress toward tenure and promotion.

1. Schools and colleges must establish written criteria for promotion and tenure evaluation and make them available to all untenured faculty. If the school or college permits early or late review, or a second review, the school or college is encouraged to make that explicit and, where possible, to articulate criteria for early or late review. Principles of academic freedom must be respected in evaluating the candidate for tenure.

2. The tenure review must include a careful examination of the candidate’s credentials and performance by a committee of the faculty. Unless an exception is agreed to by the provost, the review must include external
evaluations; internal evaluations are encouraged but not required.

3. Tenure recommendations to the dean must be made by a committee, the majority of whom are tenured members of the school or college faculty. Tenure recommendations that are to be forwarded to the Regents must proceed according to Regents’ Bylaws 5.08.

4. When the dean of the school or college decides to recommend or not to recommend a faculty member for tenure, or if a decision is made to defer and conduct a second review, that decision must be communicated to the candidate in writing in a timely fashion. When a file is transmitted to the provost, the faculty member should be told that there will be no further school or college review unless required by the provost. It is also the responsibility of the school or college to communicate to the faculty member when the school or college has been informed that a negative recommendation from the school or college has been affirmed or rejected by the provost.

In certain circumstances, the dean or provost or a duly authorized elected or appointed faculty committee may, where consistent with the policies of the University and the school or college, decide that a second review is appropriate and the tenure decision should be deferred; that second review must be completed within the time limits established by Regents’ Bylaw 5.09.

E. University Policies On Joint or Partial Tenure Appointments

With respect to members of the faculty who hold tenured regular instructional appointments in more than one school or college of the university, or who hold part-time appointments with tenure, a general governing principle is that the tenure rights the university confers on faculty are indivisible. That is, no faculty member holding tenure may be dismissed from the University of Michigan, demoted, or have his or her appointment reduced below the level at which tenure was awarded except pursuant to the Program Discontinuance Guidelines (SPG 601.02) or Regents’ Bylaws 5.08 and 5.09. At the same time, if the university has awarded tenure to a faculty member for a less than a full-time, fractional appointment, the university is not obliged to increase that appointment (e.g., to full-time).

For each faculty member who holds tenure-track but untenured appointments in more than one school or college, the appointing schools and colleges must select a “primary home” for the faculty member—unless otherwise mutually agreed upon by all parties (the faculty member and the dean, director, or chair of each of the appointing schools and colleges). The policies and practices of that primary home will then govern any subsequent decisions leading to a recommendation concerning the awarding of tenure to that faculty member. In such cases, the tenure granted may be associated with only one of the fractional appointments. In instances where tenure could be awarded in more than one school or college, the policies and practices of each school or college will govern any decision(s) leading to a recommendation concerning the awarding of tenure in that school or college.

F. Relation between University and School or College Policies for Tenure and Promotion Reviews

University practice permits each school and college to adopt policies concerning promotion and tenure reviews for full- and part-time members of its “regular tenure track instructional faculty.” As described above, each school or college must establish its own probationary period after which candidates for tenure are evaluated and are recommended for tenure, given notice of non-reappointment, or given the option to have a second review under school or college policies. SPG 201.92 Tenure Probationary Period: Effects on Tenure Clock of Childbearing and Dependent Care Responsibilities requires the exclusion, upon request of the faculty member, of one year for each childbirth (up to a total of two years) from the countable years of service that constitute a tenure probationary period. In total, the schools and colleges may approve up to two years’ extensions of the tenure probationary period for childbirth and/or dependent care, as long as the resulting probationary period remains consistent with Bylaw 5.09. The school or college must notify the provost annually and in writing of all exclusions and exceptions it has granted. Any extension that would place review beyond the University probationary period requires the permission of the provost. Each school or college may develop policies on whether or not to count time spent on various leaves toward the school or college probationary period. The criteria for tenure do not vary but remain the same whether or not the candidate has received an extension of the tenure clock.

The maximum length of each school and college probationary period is limited by Regents’ Bylaw 5.09 and the university’s policy on notice of non-reappointment, as described above in section II.B. and also in SPG
201.88 Notice of Non-reappointment.

The procedures and criteria of each school or college should be articulated in writing to each faculty member at the time of his or her initial appointment. The standards for tenure should not vary according to the length of an individual faculty member’s probationary period, but should be applied consistently in all tenure decisions made by a school or college.

G. Guidelines for Modifying the Tenure Probationary Period within the Schools and Colleges

The presumptive tenure probationary period of a school or college must fall within the maximum permitted by the University clock. The presumptive probationary period of a school or college may be set and modified in compliance with the policies of the school or college. The school or college must specify the faculty to whom the change in the clock will apply. Normally, the new period would apply to all untenured faculty currently on the tenure track, as well as future faculty.

When a school or college modifies its clock, it should review and, if necessary, change its related policies. Before final adoption, the modification and proposed revisions must be reviewed and approved by the provost.

1 Non-tenured faculty have the right to the procedures specified in Regents’ Bylaw 5.09 when the University seeks dismissal during the term of appointment specified in the employment contract.

2 See SPG 201.34-1 Classification and Appointment of Instructional Faculty.

3 For information regarding notice of non-reappointment, see SPG 201.88 Notice of Non-reappointment and footnote 12 below.

4 No more than one year (two academic terms) may be accumulated in a twelve-month period.

5 SPG 201.92 Tenure Probationary Period: Effects on Tenure Clock of Childbearing and Dependent Care Responsibilities specifies that a woman shall, upon written request to the dean, be granted an exclusion of one year for each event of childbirth, up to a maximum of two years. It also permits a dean, upon written request from the faculty member, to exclude up to two years for dependent care. However, no more than two years can be excluded from the tenure clock under SPG 201.92 for any one faculty member.

6 As used herein, “faculty member” shall mean non-tenured regular instructional faculty member with the rank of instructor or higher.

7 Years of appointment are counted according to “Rules Concerning Acquiring the Protection of Regents’ Bylaw 5.09 by Accumulating Years of Service” (Regents’ Proceedings, September 1985).

8 Any employment as a member of the faculty beyond one terminal year must be approved in writing by the provost of the appropriate campus.

9 When a school or college decides to defer a tenure decision until a subsequent year within the probationary period specified by Regents’ Bylaw 5.09, the Provost’s Office does not need to be notified of the decision to defer.

10 Where a faculty member’s appointment is to conclude at the end of the Winter Term of the current academic year, SPG 201.88 requires that the faculty member be given notice of termination by September 15 of that year. Where the appointment will be terminated at some time other than the end of the Winter Term, the faculty member must receive nine months’ advance notice and be no later than the tenth year of employment.

11 If the penultimate year of appointment expires at a time other than the end of the Winter Term, the notice must be given no later than a date nine months prior to the termination date of the penultimate year and no later than the ninth year of employment.

12 “Full-time” is defined in the “Rules Concerning Acquiring the Protection of Regents’ Bylaw 5.09 by Accumulating Years of Service” (Regents’ Proceedings, September 1985, and SPG 201.13).


14 For further information, see Guidelines for Joint Academic Appointments at the University of Michigan [http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/joint_appointments/Joint_Appts.html].

15 Titles specified as “regular instructional faculty” are defined in SPG 201.34-1 Classification and Appointment of Instructional Faculty.

16 See SPG 201.88 Notice of Non-reappointment.

17 If the tenure decision is deferred, the notice of non-reappointment can be given either concurrently with the deferral or after the second review.
Leaves are defined in the Standard Practice Guide (e.g., SPG 201.30 Leaves of Absence; SPG 201.30-1 Leaves of Absence Without Salary; SPG 201.30-2 Sabbatical Leave; SPG 201.30-4 Scholarly Activity Leave).

Hard copies of this document are considered uncontrolled. If you have a printed version, please refer to the University SPG website (spg.umich.edu) for the official, most recent version.
I. Policy

Scholarly Activity Leaves not in excess of one year may be granted by the President or a designated representative on recommendation of the dean (Ann Arbor Campus) or Chancellor (Flint or Dearborn campus). Such leaves may be granted to:

1. Allow faculty members to accept “prestigious fellowships”, or
2. To allow faculty members to accept a temporary appointment at another institution when the appointment would, in the interest of the University, permit the faculty member to engage in scholarly activities that would not be otherwise practicably available, and that would significantly enhance the professional effectiveness of the faculty member.

II. Regulations and Definitions

A. Scholarly Activity Leaves are reported monthly to the Board of Regents.

B. Compensation During Leave

1. Salary - Leaves will normally be without salary, but if the award or available salary from the fellowship or other institution is less than the individual’s regular salary, at the request of the dean or Chancellor, a supplement may be provided to maintain the faculty member’s regular salary, or a portion thereof. Such supplements may be provided only if permitted by the rules of the fellowship or the other institution involved.

2. Benefits - During a scholarly activity leave, the University will continue the faculty member’s enrollment in the benefit plans he or she was enrolled in immediately before the leave began, and will also continue to make University contributions toward those plans—under the terms described below.

   Contingent on eligibility, during the leave the University will continue to cover the full cost of all benefit plans the faculty member is enrolled in that the University pays for in full (no employee contribution is required).

   However, for the faculty member to continue to be enrolled in benefit plans that require a contribution from the faculty member, the University will continue these benefits and make contributions to them during the leave only if the faculty member makes the necessary employee contributions. Retirement contributions by the University will be based on actual salary paid by the University during the leave.

   If the faculty member has elected a benefit plan that requires an employee contribution but does not make the necessary contributions during the leave, the University will discontinue coverage for the duration of the leave.

   If the individual is ineligible for University contributions for expanded long term disability prior to the leave, but accrues the required years of service during the leave, the individual will become eligible for University contributions once the years of service are met. The individual may also begin contributions if applicable. If the individual is eligible to participate in a disability plan through another employer, the University of Michigan protection through the expanded long term disability plan is discontinued.

   For questions about other benefit plans the faculty member should contact the HR Payroll Service Center.

3. Vacation - No vacation allowance will be accumulated or paid while an individual is on Scholarly Activity Leave. Vacation allowances accumulated prior to the leave will be available upon return to active service at the University.

4. Sick Leave - No sick leave allowance will be paid during the period of Scholarly Activity Leave. Sick leave allowances available prior to the leave will be available upon return to active service at the University.
5. Length of Service - University service will continue to be accumulated during the leave.
6. Sabbatical Equity - Sabbatical equity will not be earned during a Scholarly Activity Leave.
7. Retirement Furlough Equity - Retirement furlough equity will continue to accrue during a Scholarly Activity Leave.

C. Return Prior to Expiration - Return to active service prior to the expiration of the Scholarly Activity Leave will be at the option of the Chair or Director and Dean. Individuals who become incapacitated during a leave, resulting in cessation of external funding, will be returned to their former University status and provided any benefits that were available prior to the beginning of the Scholarly Activity Leave.

Procedures: [http://hr.umich.edu/procedures/spg201-30-4.html](http://hr.umich.edu/procedures/spg201-30-4.html)
Classification and Appointment of Instructional Faculty

I. Instructional faculty classifications and appointments

The University classifies its instructional faculty as described below. Unless otherwise noted, the appointments described below are appointments not covered under collective bargaining agreements.

A. Tenure track faculty

The tenure track faculty consists of tenure track assistant professors and instructors, and tenure track and tenured professors and associate professors.

Note: Tenure track professorial faculty may also hold additional appointment as adjunct instructional faculty as adjunct professor, adjunct associate professor, adjunct assistant professor, adjunct instructor, or adjunct lecturer.

Professor and associate professor

The title of professor or associate professor is given only to persons of established professional position and demonstrated scholarly or creative ability. The difference between the two ranks is primarily one of achievement. Unless otherwise specified, appointments with these titles are with tenure. An appointment with either title may be made without tenure. Members of the tenured professorial faculty will be appointed by the Board of Regents on recommendation of:

- the appropriate dean or executive committee, and
- at the Ann Arbor campus by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, or
- at the University of Michigan-Dearborn or University of Michigan-Flint campus by the chancellor, and
- by the president.

Assistant professor

The title of assistant professor is given to persons of proven ability who have acceptable experience (a) at the rank of instructor at the University, instructor or higher at another institution, or (b) in professional work. Appointments are made either for one term or, in the case of persons with proven ability, for not more than four years. Appointments are without tenure but are tenure-track. They will be appointed by the chancellor (University of Michigan-Dearborn and University of Michigan-Flint campuses) and the president on recommendation of the dean and the executive committee of the appropriate school, college, or division.

Instructor

The title of instructor is given to persons who hold a doctorate or its equivalent in professional experience, or who have completed a major part of the work toward a doctorate, and have shown evidence of special ability as a teacher or scholar. Appointments are made either for one term or, in the case of persons with proven ability, for not more than four years. Appointments are without tenure but are tenure-track. They will be appointed by the chancellor (University of Michigan-Dearborn and University of Michigan-Flint campuses) and the president on recommendation of the dean and executive committee of the appropriate school, college, or division.

B. Clinical instructional faculty

An academic unit may be authorized to appoint clinical instructional staff to support its instructional program only if the school, college, or division has adopted a policy authorizing such appointments in accordance with its bylaws and the policy has been approved by the appropriate provost, chancellor (University of Michigan-Flint and University of Michigan-Dearborn), president and Board of Regents.
Clinical instructional appointments are at appointment fractions of 50 percent or greater, and are without tenure. The following titles may be used for clinical instructional appointments: clinical professor, clinical associate professor, clinical assistant professor, clinical instructor, or clinical lecturer.

Appointments to the clinical track are for a fixed term, cannot exceed seven years in duration, and may be renewed. The appropriate school, college, or division will establish appointment and promotion criteria. The school, college, or division bylaws may further define the rights and responsibilities of clinical faculty, consistent with the Regents’ Bylaws.

Clinical assistant professors, clinical instructors, and clinical lecturers will be appointed by the chancellor (University of Michigan-Dearborn and University of Michigan-Flint) and the president on recommendation of the chair or director of the appropriate academic department or program and the dean of the appropriate school, college, or division. Clinical professors and clinical associate professors will be appointed by the chancellor (University of Michigan-Dearborn and University of Michigan-Flint), and the president on recommendation of the chair or director of the appropriate academic department or program; the dean of the appropriate school, college, or division; and the appropriate provost.

C. Lecturers

Under some circumstances the University appoints lecturers who are not covered by the collective bargaining agreement between the University and the Lecturers’ Employee Organization (LEO). For such appointments, the title of lecturer is given to persons who do not appropriately fall in the other ranks this policy describes. Appointments are made either for one term or, in the case of persons of proven ability, for not more than four years, and are without tenure. They will be appointed by the chancellor (University of Michigan-Dearborn and University of Michigan-Flint campuses) and the president on recommendation of the dean and executive committee of the appropriate school, college, or division.

D. Lecturers covered under a collective bargaining agreement

This group of instructional faculty are lecturers who are covered by the collective bargaining agreement between the University and the Lecturers’ Employee Organization (LEO).

E. Adjunct instructional faculty covered under a collective bargaining agreement

Adjunct instructional faculty are covered by the collective bargaining agreement between the University and the Lecturers’ Employee Organization (LEO) unless they also hold a tenure track professorial faculty appointment (see Section I.A).

F. Adjunct clinical instructional faculty

To supplement the University’s instructional program, any academic unit may appoint professional practitioners in the community or within the University at appointment fractions below 50 percent as adjunct clinical professors, adjunct clinical associate professors, adjunct clinical assistant professors, adjunct clinical instructors, or adjunct clinical lecturers.

Appointments as adjunct clinical instructional faculty are on an annual or shorter basis and are without tenure. The school, college, or division will establish appointment and/or promotion criteria.

They will be appointed by the chancellor (University of Michigan-Dearborn and University of Michigan-Flint) and the president on recommendation of the dean and executive committee of the appropriate school, college, or division.

G. Visiting instructional faculty

To supplement the instructional program at the University, individuals whose ongoing employment responsibilities lie outside the University at another institution of higher education may be appointed as visiting professors, visiting associate professors, visiting assistant professors, visiting instructors, visiting lecturers, visiting clinical professors, visiting clinical associate professors, visiting clinical assistant professors, visiting clinical instructors, or visiting clinical lecturers.

Appointments as visiting instructional faculty are for one year or less, may be extended only under unusual circumstances, and are without tenure. Visiting instructional appointments may be made at any rank but must be consistent with the individual’s professional stature. The school, college, or division will establish appointment criteria for this set of titles.
They will be appointed by the chancellor (University of Michigan-Dearborn and University of Michigan-Flint) and the president on recommendation of the dean and executive committee of the appropriate school, college, or division.

II. Definitions

**Regular instructional faculty.** For definitional purposes in other Standard Practice Guides, the term “regular instructional faculty” includes tenure track faculty (I.A. above), clinical instructional faculty (I.B. above), lecturers (I.C above), and lecturers (bargained-for) (I.D above).

**Supplemental instructional faculty.** For definitional purposes in other Standard Practice Guides, the term “supplemental instructional faculty” includes adjunct instructional faculty (bargained-for) (I.E above), adjunct clinical instructional faculty (I.F. above), and visiting instructional faculty (I.G. above).
Principles and Practices Governing Tenure for Faculty Members with Divided or Partial Appointments (Regular Instructional Staff)

Tenure is granted to certain eligible faculty members at the ranks of associate professor and professor by the Regents of the University upon recommendation of the appropriate departmental chair, dean, executive committee, and at the University of Michigan-Dearborn or the University of Michigan-Flint by the Chancellor, and by the President (Regents’ Bylaw 5.08[4]). Unless otherwise specified, a faculty member with tenure is presumed to hold tenure in his or her department, if the school or college is so organized; in the school or college; and in the University of Michigan except pursuant to the Program Discontinuance Guidelines or Regents’ Bylaws 5.08 and 5.09. Faculty rights conferred by the University with respect to tenure are described in Regents’ Bylaws 5.08 and 5.09 and the Program Discontinuance Guidelines.

This document describes the principles and practices pertaining to tenure for those members of the faculty who hold regular instructional appointment in more than one unit of the university, or who hold part-time appointments. The most general principle is that faculty rights conferred by the University with respect to tenure are indivisible. That is, no faculty member holding tenure may be dismissed from the University of Michigan, demoted, or have his or her appointment reduced below the level at which tenure was awarded except pursuant to the Program Discontinuance Guidelines or Regents’ Bylaws 5.08 and 5.09. At the same time, if tenure in a unit is associated with a fractional appointment, the University is not obliged to increase that individual’s appointment to full-time in that unit.

Information about a faculty member’s tenure status appears on the Notice of Terms and Conditions of Appointment received from the President of the University by each faculty member each year. Year to year, fluctuations in actual assignments across different appointing units do not change a unit’s responsibility for the faculty member’s “with tenure” appointment fraction, but may affect the source of funds used to support that faculty member’s salary in any given year. If the faculty member’s appointment within a unit awarding tenure is reduced in any given year, that appointing unit shall reestablish the original fractional appointment at which tenure was granted upon request by the faculty member. This understanding is, of course, modifiable through mutual agreement or pursuant to the Program Discontinuance Guidelines or Regents’ Bylaws 5.08 or 5.09.

Unless otherwise mutually agreed upon by all parties (the faculty member and the dean, director, or chair of each of the appointing units), a primary unit should be identified for each faculty member holding “without tenure” appointments in more than one unit. The policies and practices of that primary unit will then normally govern any subsequent decision regarding the awarding of tenure to that faculty member. In such cases, the tenure granted may be associated with only one of the fractional appointments. In instances where tenure could be awarded in more than one unit, the policies and practices of each unit will normally govern any decision(s) regarding the awarding of tenure in each particular appointing unit.

1 The Provost must also approve any recommendation for promotion.
I. Policy

The purpose of this policy is to define the minimum requirements for giving notice of non-reappointment to non-bargained-for instructional faculty. A school or college may establish written procedures to provide for earlier notice.

Instructional activities by their nature require planning and commitments for a reasonable period of time into the future. Neither the interests of the University nor those of the individual instructional faculty member are well served by unplanned abrupt changes in the mutual commitment implicit in an instructional appointment. To this end, the University provides the following commitments as to the Notice of Non-reappointment that it will provide to instructional appointees, and would expect that individuals deciding to end their instructional relationship with the University would provide their department or unit appropriate notice.

II. Standards

All term appointments are considered terminal upon the completion of the terms and conditions of the appointment. However, for regular instructional faculty members who are on the tenure track but are not yet tenured, it is the University’s intent to notify these individuals of non-reappointment according to the guidelines below.

For clinical instructional faculty, there may be an expectation of reappointment. Where such an expectation exists, it is the University’s intent to notify these individuals of non-reappointment according to the guidelines below.

For non-bargained-for supplemental faculty (i.e., adjunct instructional faculty, adjunct clinical faculty, visiting instructional faculty, and visiting clinical instructional faculty at appointment fractions of less than 50%), notice of non-reappointment is not required.

| TENURE TRACK FACULTY WITHOUT TENURE CLINICAL INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AND LECTURERS (NON-BARGAINED FOR) |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Length of Appointment and Term In Which It Will End** | **Required Notice of Non-Reappointment** |
| Less than one year in appointment | No later than three (3) months before the date on which the faculty member’s appointment will end |
| More than one year but less than two years in appointment, and appointment will be terminated at the end of Term II (Winter Term) | By December 15 of the faculty member’s final academic year in the appointment |
| More than one year but less than two years in appointment, and appointment will be terminated on a date other than at the end of Term II (Winter Term) | No later than the date that would provide the faculty member with five (5) months’ advance notice of the termination date |
| More than two years in a single appointment OR more than two years in a combination of two or more appointments held continuously over two or more years, and the appointment will be terminated at the end of Term II (Winter Term) | By September 15 of the faculty member’s final academic year in the appointment |
| More than two years in a single appointment OR more than two years in a combination of two or more appointments held | No later than the date that would provide the faculty member with nine (9) months’ advance notice of the termination date |
TENURE TRACK FACULTY WITHOUT TENURE CLINICAL INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AND LECTURERS (NON-BARGAINED FOR)

continuously over two or more years, and the appointment will be terminated on a date other than at the end of Term II (Winter Term)

NON-BARGAINED-FOR SUPPLEMENTAL FACULTY
(Adjunct Instructional Faculty, Adjunct Clinical Faculty, Visiting Instructional Faculty, and Visiting Clinical Instructional Faculty)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Appointment and Term In Which It Will End</th>
<th>Required Notice of Non-Reappointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any number of years ending in any term</td>
<td>No notice of non-reappointment is required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. For tenure-track faculty in their sixth year of appointment, see also SPG 201.50, Guidelines Related to Tenure Reviews and Reappointment Reviews.

2. Also see SPG 201.34-1 Classification of Instructional Faculty

Procedures: [http://www.hr.umich.edu/procedures/spg201-88.htm](http://www.hr.umich.edu/procedures/spg201-88.htm)
Tenure Probationary Period: Effects on Tenure Clock of Childbearing and Dependent Care Responsibilities

I. Policy
   A. Childbearing
      In recognition of the effects that pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions can have upon the time and energy a woman has to devote to her professional responsibilities and thus her ability to work at the pace or level expected to achieve tenure, a woman who bears one or more children during her tenure probationary period shall, upon written request to the relevant dean, or in the case of the Dearborn and Flint campuses, the relevant provost, be granted an exclusion of one year for each event of childbirth from the countable years of service that constitute such tenure probationary period, up to a maximum of two years.
   
   B. Dependent Care
      Also, the demands of caring for dependents (such as children, including newly adopted children; ill or injured partners; or aging parents) may seriously affect the time and energy faculty have to devote to their professional responsibilities during the tenure probationary period. In recognition of the difficulty of combining an academic career with such dependent care demands, a faculty member in such circumstances may, upon written request to the relevant dean, or, in the case of the Dearborn and Flint campuses, the relevant provost, be granted an exclusion of one year from the countable years of service that constitute that individual’s tenure probationary period.
   
   C. General
      No more than two years may be excluded from the countable years of service that constitute an individual’s tenure probationary period at the University of Michigan under this policy, regardless of the combination of circumstances.
      
      To promote University-wide consistency, a copy of all requests and responses made under this policy will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Human Resources for review and reporting to 1) the provost, for faculty on the Ann Arbor campus, or 2) the relevant chancellor, for faculty on the UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint campuses.
      
      Faculty who benefit from this policy will work throughout the tenure probationary period carrying their normal range of responsibilities, unless alternative arrangements have been made.
   
   D. Applicability
      Events which occur in the final year of a faculty member’s tenure probationary period may not be the basis for a request for application of this policy.
      
      All requests under this policy must be made prior to the date which has been communicated to the faculty member as the date on which the unit will initiate the tenure review.
      
      An exclusion of one year from the countable years of service that constitute the tenure probationary period shall have no effect on the length of a faculty member’s term appointment.

II. Other Relevant Policies

Faculty members who experience childbearing and dependent care responsibilities might also want to review:

SPG 201.11-1, “Sick Leave Plan – Academic Appointments” which describes the coverage available to women during pregnancy and childbirth;
SPG 201.93, “Modified Duties for New Parents” concerning relief from teaching responsibilities for pregnancy, childbirth, and adoption; and

SPG 201.30-1, “Leaves of Absence without Salary” which describes the eligibility and duration of child care, medical, and personal leave.

Procedures: [http://www.umich.edu/~hraa/procedures/spg201-92.htm](http://www.umich.edu/~hraa/procedures/spg201-92.htm)

1 With respect to caring for one or more newly born or adopted children under the dependent care section of this policy, during the year for which the exclusion is requested the faculty member must take significant and sustained care-giving responsibility for the child (or children) as a single parent or, where there are two parents, must take care-giving responsibility that is at least as time-consuming as the care-giving responsibility of the faculty member’s spouse or partner.
Discontinuance of Academic Programs

The continuing intellectual vigor and distinction of the University will depend in some measure upon our capacity to provide critical and timely reviews of all existing programs and to adapt them in the light of changing intellectual interests, professional developments, social needs, and relative academic strengths and priorities. In a period of financial stringency, such review becomes of particular importance, not least because most new programs will have to be developed by replacement rather than addition, and partly because it becomes difficult to strengthen weak or limited programs by accretional funding.

Our success in withstanding the financial adversity of the last few years has been due in part to our willingness to make hard decisions involving differential cuts and allocations, not only among different units of the same School or College, but also among the Schools, Colleges, Centers and Institutes themselves. It is our intention to strive to maintain the distinction of the University by continuing this system of careful scrutiny, judicious planning, and careful budget allocation. Only in this way can we preserve and enhance the quality of our various programs.

From time to time during this process of review, evaluation, and planning we shall find that a particular program raises concerns which may appear to justify its reduction or even its elimination. It is for this reason that we now offer the following procedures which will apply in cases of program termination.

If it is decided that a program should be considered for elimination, then procedures and policies are needed to answer four different questions:

- What criteria should be used in making these decisions?
- Who should decide which programs to eliminate?
- What safeguards should be given to tenured and non tenured faculty, and other employees, if a program is eliminated?
- What safeguards should be given to students in the program?

I. What Criteria Should Be Used?

A program may be eliminated because it fails to meet the requirements of a particular School or College for academic excellence. This is consistent with an AAUP recommendation that decisions should reflect long-range judgments about the educational mission of the unit and not cyclical or temporary variations in enrollment. Such long-term considerations will generally involve the analysis of financial resources and needs of the program and the parent unit.

Recommended Criteria

A. Criteria for determining whether a program should be eliminated ought to place greatest emphasis on the quality of the program involved. Such assessment should take into account the quality of the faculty, the value and particular character of the program and the performance of its students.

B. Is the program central to the overall mission of the administrative unit in which it is located? This issue of centrality must consider the role and mission of the program in the context of the perceived role of the University.

C. Is the program under consideration too costly in relation to other educational and program needs of the School or College? Here the total resources, not just general and/or instructional funds, must be considered. This consideration should also involve present and projected enrollments, and societal needs. Is the program so central and valuable that its high costs and low enrollment are acceptable alternatives to closing?

D. Is a comparable program offered at another institution within the State of Michigan?

E. Can the program be made less costly or combined with other units to bring it more in line with the role and mission of the School or College and financial resources of the University? Alternatively, should it be relocated outside the parent School or College, in some other unit, or as an independent unit within the University?

F. Does the program have a significant service-value to other units within the University?
II. Who Should Decide?

The ultimate responsibility for the discontinuance of a program rests with the Board of Regents. They are given legislative authority for the operation of the University; however, they may delegate sub-legislative powers to various University authorities. For example, Regents’ Bylaw 5.02 states, “…the governing faculty shall be in charge of the affairs of the School or College, except as delegated to the executive committee, if any,...” Also, “The faculty of each School and College shall from time to time recommend to the Board for approval such regulations as are not included in these Bylaws and which are pertinent to its structure and major operating procedures, such as departmental organization...” (Bylaw 5.03). Also the Dean and/or Executive Committee of a School or College “shall be charged with the duties of investigating and formulating educational and instructional policies for consideration by the faculty and shall act for the faculty in matters of budgets, promotions and appointments” (Bylaw 5.06). The matter of program discontinuance will almost always involve consideration and evaluation of both curricular and budgetary matters. Although the pattern of this consideration and evaluation will depend upon the traditions, practices and style of each School or College, the recommendation for closure of a program should emanate from the Dean and/or the Executive Committee, following prior faculty consultation and after the Governing Faculty of the appropriate School or College has met and formally expressed its views regarding the contemplated discontinuance. Such Governing Faculty action shall be duly noted and formally conveyed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Board of Regents, as an integral part of the closure packet.

The following procedures are consistent with current AAUP Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure which state that judgments about academic programs are the “responsibility of the Faculty or of an appropriate Faculty body.”

Recommended Procedures

A. From time to time, the Dean and/or Executive Committee of a School or College or the Governing Faculty of that unit or the Vice President for Academic Affairs may consider that a particular program may no longer be viable, or may be more effective if reorganized in some way. Periodic program reviews may also lead to a similar conclusion. In all such cases, an independent assessment of the quality and viability of a program by a peer review should then take place prior to recommending that a program be considered for discontinuance. In cases where there has been a rigorous periodic review within the previous two years, the new review committee should rely substantially upon the relevant data collected and analysis presented by the periodic review group.

In identifying a new review committee, the Dean and/or Executive Committee should consult with the faculty and should consider a mechanism that would include colleagues outside the University community as well as faculty within the School and University. In cases where there is a dispute within the School or College concerning constitution of an appropriate peer review group, the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs will consult both parties and will determine the composition of the peer review group. Such reviews will be conducted so that there will be maximum opportunity for early and meaningful consultation with faculty and students and timely action in relation to admissions, appointments, and the budget cycle.

B. The Dean and Executive Committee of each School or College may recommend to the Vice President for Academic Affairs that a program be considered for elimination, following prior faculty consultation and after the Governing Faculty of the appropriate School or College has met and formally expressed its views regarding the contemplated discontinuance. Such Governing Faculty action shall be duly noted and formally conveyed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Board of Regents, as an integral part of any closure packet.

C. With the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Dean should then set up a consultative process with the program, the governing faculty and other affected parties, both inside and outside the program, discussing with them the factors used to determine the proposed “phase out” of the program and other alternatives which may be proposed for reorganization of the program. In appropriate cases, consultation with other institutions may be arranged.

D. The Vice President shall also submit such statements of financial exigency as may be included in the recommendation for assessment to an ad hoc committee, with members from the Office of Academic Affairs, ACUB, and SACUA.

E. The results of the various reviews and recommendations should then be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

F. The review of the Vice President for Academic Affairs will be made in a prompt and timely fashion, bearing in mind the effects of prolonged debate on the individuals and units involved. Full opportunity will be provided during the review for public and private consultation and the receipt of written comments.

G. In the light of these discussions, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will make a decision on the future of the program, which shall be brought as a recommendation to the Regents.
III. What Safeguard Should Be Given to Faculty and Staff?

Existing guidelines have been established within the University to give faculty and staff adequate notice, and rights of a hearing. Every effort will also be made to assist in relocation and retraining of staff affected by discontinuance of a program.

Recommended Procedures

A. Instructional Staff

1. Existing procedures for notice of non-reappointment for non-tenured instructional staff should be followed when a program is scheduled for termination.

2. The University has never released tenured faculty members because of program closure. The maintenance of tenured faculty and of essential instructional and supporting services remains the highest priority of the University. If, however, at some future time it should become necessary to release tenured faculty members within a program to be discontinued, the following procedures will apply.

   a. Every effort should be made to place tenured instructional staff members in other suitable positions. If a reasonable period of retraining of the affected staff member would qualify him or her for another position within the University, then such retraining and relocation should be negotiated.

   b. In cases where it is not possible to continue the appointment of a tenured faculty member, as described in (a) above, the procedures of Regents’ Bylaw Section 5.09 will be available and severance pay will be provided if required under Regents’ Bylaw Section 5.10.

B. Non-Instructional Staff

Existing procedures for reduction in force will be followed for non-instructional staff who are affected by the decision to terminate a program (see appropriate Standard Practice Guide).

IV. Safeguard for Students

Because students are severely affected by the termination of a program, the following procedures will be observed:

A. Although completion of the degree or transfer cannot be guaranteed by the University, every effort will be made to accommodate student needs. So as to give students a maximum opportunity either to finish their work or to transfer to another program, the termination of a program should be phased over a period of reasonable length.

B. If and when the Vice President for Academic Affairs has approved the recommendation of the Dean and Executive Committee of the School or College to consider a program for elimination, no new admissions ought to be made without consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and also--where appropriate--the Dean of the Graduate School.

C. Opportunity should be given to students for participation in the review of programs proposed for termination.

---

1 In the case of an undergraduate program at a branch campus, the Chancellor fills the role herein described for the Vice President for Academic Affairs. In the case of a graduate program at a branch campus, the Chancellor and Vice President cooperate to jointly fill the role.

2 Because of differing terminology among the Schools and Colleges concerned with departments, divisions, programs, etc., the more generic term ‘program’ is used here. Its precise application is left in the hands of the Dean and/or Academic Vice President.