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I. INTRODUCTION

The University of Michigan-Flint (UM-Flint) School of Nursing (SON) Criteria and Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion Review addresses criteria and review procedures for promotion to associate professor and professor and the granting of tenure. This document serves the following purposes:

- Specifies overall expectations for tenure and/or promotion which reflect the profession of nursing; and
- Promotes consistency in the tenure and/or promotion review process for SON faculty

Time Periods Reviewed

When considering a request for promotion from the rank of assistant professor to associate professor with granting of tenure, supporting documentation of the professional record from the time of the faculty member’s UM-Flint appointment will be reviewed. Significant achievements prior to hire will also be considered.

In the event that the faculty member entered UM-Flint as an associate professor without tenure and is seeking tenure and/or promotion to professor, the teaching and service record will be reviewed since appointment, and the entire record of scholarly activities will be reviewed with particular emphasis on achievements since hire.

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

II. CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

All faculty members in the SON under review are evaluated in three major areas of performance consistent with the School’s mission, philosophy, and goals. The major areas of performance are: (1) teaching effectiveness; (2) scholarly activities; and (3) service to the School, University, profession, and community. Teaching, scholarship, and service are integrated, interconnected, interwoven, and often embedded in one another. This is further described in the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) (1999) position paper Defining Scholarship for the Discipline of Nursing. All SON faculty are expected to pursue professional development in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service designed to ensure they are current related to the discipline and practice of nursing.
Activities appropriate for SON faculty in each of the three major areas of performance are described in this document. These activities provide a measure of a faculty member’s contribution to the mission of the University, School, and to the profession/discipline of nursing. Endeavors which enhance and broaden professional competency in all three of the major areas are valued. Consistent with the mission of UM-Flint and the SON, interprofessional collaboration and community engagement are highly valued. The assessment of the appropriateness of specific activities and the quality and potential for professional growth of a faculty member’s performance in these areas is the responsibility of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee (TPRC).

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching with progression towards excellence and a recognizable commitment to the success of students; faculty members are expected to demonstrate significant achievement in scholarly activities and service commensurate with the rank being sought; and faculty members are expected to demonstrate ongoing professional development in the major performance areas.

A. Teaching Effectiveness

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

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

A determination of teaching effectiveness is based on multiple sources of data collected since hire or last review as appropriate, including: subject matter knowledge; demonstration of effective presentation style; appropriate course design, planning and evaluation; adoption of meaningful assessment; and interaction/ability to engage students.

Student course evaluations obtained through School-approved methods are essential. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness includes:

- peer review/evaluation of teaching (including direct observation and/or review of online Blackboard course shells)
- feedback from workshop participants
- feedback from alumni
- commendation letters from students and/or faculty (unsolicited preferred, solicited accepted)
- teaching awards and nominations for awards
- samples of syllabi, teaching material, and contributions to student products (publications, posters, and presentations)
- documented contributions in the areas of student advising and mentoring
• participation in interprofessional and intradisciplinary teaching
• evidence of the effectiveness of contributions related to curriculum and/or course development and outcome assessment
• demonstrated use of diverse teaching modalities or integration of multiple ways of knowing in the study of nursing (use of technology, high impact practices, and other creative or non-traditional teaching methods)
• evidence of ongoing self-assessment, professional development, and improvement related to teaching

For promotion from associate professor to professor, the evidence is expected to reflect a higher development of leadership in these activities. Additional evidence appropriate for the rank of professor includes mentorship of junior faculty, dissemination of teaching innovations, development of professional standards, assisting with preparation for accreditation processes of professional programs, scholarly products related to the scholarship of teaching and learning, and/or provision of continuing education.

B. Scholarly Activities

All SON faculty are expected to pursue scholarship designed to ensure they are current in the theory, knowledge, skills, and pedagogy of nursing as an academic discipline and as a healthcare profession. The scholarly expectations for nursing faculty are consistent with the mission and purposes of the SON and UM-Flint. Practice-focused scholarship as well as research-focused scholarship are valued. Distinctions and examples of practice-focused scholarship are presented in the AACN (2015) white paper *The Doctor of Nursing Practice: Current Issues and Clarifying Recommendations.*

Scholarship should generate intellectual inspiration for students and faculty and improve the health and well-being of the local, regional, national, and global communities that the SON serves. Scholarship also should develop faculty’s and students’ ability to think and work in the world beyond the University while fostering intellectual curiosity, critical thinking, clinical problem solving, cultural competence, ethical decision making, and related traits that contribute to the generalization and/or transferability of new knowledge, creating models for applying and transferring knowledge in clinical settings, or fresh perspectives on existing knowledge. The results or outcomes of scholarship should be reported and widely disseminated through respected and reputable professional channels in written, oral, electronic, and other formats.

Boyer (1990) provides a framework for defining scholarship that is well suited for nursing, and his conceptualization of scholarship fits well with the SON faculty’s philosophy of scholarship which extends beyond creating research for its own sake. Boyer identifies a broad range of activities as scholarly (e.g., scholarship of discovery, integration, application/engagement, and teaching) as summarized below:

• Scholarship of discovery is aimed at the development or creation of new knowledge. It represents the traditional view of research, including primary empirical research, historical research, theory development and testing, methodological studies, and philosophical inquiry and analysis.
• Scholarship of integration connects disciplines, fitting one’s own or others’ research in larger intellectual patterns. It includes educating non-specialists, explaining/interpreting findings, doing original interprofessional work, conducting integrative reviews of literature, analyzing health policy, studying healthcare systems, conducting meta-analysis, or synthesis of literature from other disciplines.

• Scholarship of application (also called the scholarship of engagement/community-engaged scholarship) applies an integrative approach to the traditional domains of research, teaching, practice, and service. This category of scholarship is the use of knowledge in problem solving in the professions, industry, government, and community. Findings of this scholarship are applied in teaching/learning and practice. It includes development of clinical knowledge such as development or application of theoretical formulations and conduct of clinically applicable research and evaluation studies, evaluation of systems of care, development of delivery modes, and taking leadership roles in developing practice that improves access to or delivery of health care.

• Scholarship of teaching produces knowledge to support the transfer of information from teacher to student. It is inquiry and/or reflection about teaching/learning; assessment; evidence gathering; peer collaboration; and review and development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative teaching methods, program development, and outcomes.

Scholarly activities may reflect one or any combination of Boyer’s categories of scholarship. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are evaluated on the quality and, to a lesser extent, quantity of their scholarly activities. Work is expected to make a contribution to the profession/field/discipline, to interprofessional areas, and/or to pedagogical endeavors. The committee review is complemented by documentation from external reviewers.

Evidence of Scholarly Activities
Evidence of the scholarship of discovery, integration, application/engagement, and teaching may vary, depending on the focus of scholarship. Evidence should include, but is not limited to, a combination of the following:

• up-to-date curriculum vitae inclusive of all supporting evidence
• scholarship narrative statement including:
  o candidate’s identified and projected lines of scholarship
  o description of progressive development of a focused program(s) of research
  o description and classification of candidate’s scholarship (e.g., Boyer’s Model categories of scholarship or other models)
  o Description of role/contribution in co-authored publications, grant proposals, presentations, and other scholarly products
  o Evidence of scholarship impact and regional, national, and/or international recognition of scholarly achievements
• peer-reviewed research-based, interprofessional, pedagogical, and/or clinical publications
• publications in non-reviewed journals
• invited authorship and editorials
• funded (or approved but not funded) extramural grant proposals
• funded intramural grant proposals for research and/or creative scholarly projects
• peer-reviewed and invited keynote, podium, and/or poster presentations at regional, national, and/or international professional conferences
• monographs, books, chapters in books, and conference proceedings
• development and implementation of workshops related to identified areas of scholarship
• consultation reports
• development of policy papers and legislation
• creative or scholarly products
• honors, awards, and/or other forms of evidence of regional, national, and/or international reputation and recognition for scholarly achievements
• letters of support from internal/external colleagues (solicited or unsolicited)
• letters of support by arm’s length external reviewers from Masters Level Teaching Universities (preferred) or higher that, when taken together on balance, indicate support for the candidate’s promotion to associate professor or professor
• evidence of professional development related to research and scholarly activities

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

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

SON faculty are expected to provide service to the School, University, profession, and the community. Consistent with the mission of the SON, professional service contributions to the local and regional community are valued as well as national and international contributions. The quality and impact of service contributions are valued.

Service to the School and University may include administrative activities, participation on various standing and ad hoc committees or task forces, and involvement in recruitment, accreditation, or other School and/or University projects or initiatives that contribute to the vision, mission, and goals of the SON at UM-Flint.

Service to the profession may include professional association activities, including holding office in professional organizations and participating on task forces, standard, and ad hoc committees; participation in SON activities such as site visits or other professional association or accreditation activities; writing items for registries or licensure and/or certification exams; or providing professional services which include consultation, continuing education, and workshops.

Service to the community may include professional consultation, serving in appointed or elected positions in community groups related to health care, providing professional in-service training and workshops, and representing the profession or University to a variety of community groups. In general, activities which involve the contributions of faculty expertise in community settings are recognized as community service.
For some professional faculty, participation in clinical activities, sometimes referred to as “faculty clinical practice”, may be required or desirable as part of the faculty role. This expectation, where relevant, may be an additional requirement for specific program faculty and may be considered a service to the community. Outcomes or products of clinical practice, depending on the nature of the contribution, may be considered as the scholarship of application.

Evidence of Service Activities
Documentation of service contributions to the University, profession, and community may include:

- evidence related to volunteer non-paid clinical practice
- letters or certificates from those familiar with the significance of the contribution (e.g., leaders or recipients of service)
- letters from those familiar with the significance of contributions related to service on committees
- documented contributions to mentoring of faculty
- written reports
- journals, books, and professional organizations to which a candidate is invited to serve as a manuscript reviewer/referee, editorial board member, or grant reviewer
- dissemination in the lay press (if appropriately related to teaching, scholarship, service, and/or practice)
- evidence of professional development in areas related to service
- other products of the service

For promotion from associate professor to professor, demonstration of a consistent commitment to service, leadership roles in service activities, and mentorship of junior faculty with regard to service activities are expected.

III. INITIATION OF TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION REVIEW OF FACULTY

A. Request for Tenure and/or Promotion

Readiness for promotion and/or tenure varies among faculty based on a wide variety of personal, professional, and work-related factors. A SON faculty member may seek promotion and/or tenure at such time the faculty member’s record of accomplishments provides evidence consistent with the rank and granting of tenure which is sought; however, a non-tenured tenure track faculty must initiate a review by no later than February 1 of the winter term in the 6th year of the University appointment to the tenure track, counted according to The University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents 5.09 and the Standard Practice Guide 201.13 http://www.spg.umich.edu/policy/201.13. The tenure clock guidelines are further described in the UM Office of the Provost Guidelines regarding University of Michigan Policies that Govern Time to Tenure Review (“The Tenure Clock”) and Related Matters http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/tenure_review/policies.html.

The request for tenure and/or promotion review is submitted by the faculty member to the SON Director of Undergraduate or Graduate Nursing Affairs and Dean in the form of a one-page summary of his/her accomplishments providing evidence of readiness for tenure and/or
promotion in the areas of teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service and a current curriculum vitae. The tenure and promotion review request and all subsequent deadlines/due dates shall be made in accordance with the established SON timeline consistent with the tenure and promotion cycle established each year by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The SON Director of Undergraduate or Graduate Nursing Affairs and Dean, in consultation with the faculty candidate, will determine readiness for a full review. Upon agreement, the Director of Undergraduate or Graduate Nursing Affairs will write a letter of support.

The faculty candidate’s summary of accomplishments, current curriculum vitae, and letter of support written by the Director must be received in the Dean’s Office in compliance with the established timeline.

### B. Tenure and Promotion Review Committee

#### Appointment of the Committee

The Tenure and Promotion Review Committee shall be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Executive Committee and the faculty member seeking promotion. The chair will be a SON faculty member. The chair will be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Leadership Council and the faculty member. The Executive Committee will be notified of this appointment.

#### Composition of the Committee

The Tenure and Promotion Review Committee shall consist of three tenured faculty members at the level of appointment being sought or higher. (For promotion from associate professor to professor, the majority of the committee shall be professors.) Members of the Leadership Council who provide direct supervision to the faculty member being reviewed shall not serve. At least one member of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee shall not be concurrently a member of the Executive Committee. At least one tenured member of the Executive Committee shall not serve on the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee.

Whenever possible, at least one member of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee shall be a faculty member from the program level (undergraduate or graduate) of the faculty being reviewed.

If unable to constitute a Tenure and Promotion Review Committee as noted above, the following faculty may also serve on the committee: faculty from another UM-Flint academic unit at or above the rank being considered; or a University of Michigan Ann Arbor School of Nursing tenured faculty. An external committee member must be oriented to the SON Criteria and Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion Review and the procedures to be followed. Committee members should be qualified to review the candidate’s quality of work. A resource person may be requested by the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee to aid them by providing input regarding the candidate’s specialty focus. This person will be identified by the Dean in consultation with the Executive Committee. The continued use of the resource person is the prerogative of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee. The resource person may be
excused from committee deliberations at the discretion of the committee and will not be present for the vote.

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

IV. TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW COMMITTEE FUNCTIONS AND PROCEDURES

A. Relationship between the Dean and the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee

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

B. Relationship between the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee and the Candidate

The chair may communicate directly with the candidate for clarification and to request additional materials.

C. Materials Reviewed

Materials reviewed by the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee include the letter of support written by the Director of Undergraduate or Graduate Nursing Affairs on behalf of the faculty member being reviewed addressing the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service; the candidate’s electronic portfolio; supporting materials which cannot be uploaded into an electronic portfolio; and letters from the external reviewers.

D. Electronic Portfolio

The candidate is responsible for assembling an electronic portfolio in support of their tenure and/or promotion request by the established due date. A template (Blackboard shell) for the portfolio with guidance/instructions for its use will be provided by the School of Nursing.

Materials to be included in the candidate’s electronic portfolio and provided by the candidate are listed below. The list of examples is not necessarily exhaustive. It is intended as a guide for consideration as faculty are considered for tenure and/or promotion. Refer to Section II A-C as well as the AACN position paper Defining Scholarship for the Discipline of Nursing and Boyer’s work on Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate for additional evidence that is relevant within each of the areas to justify tenure and/or promotion to the next rank.
Whenever possible, activities subsequent to initial appointment and/or the last promotion should be clearly delineated from activities prior to the last promotion. The electronic portfolio should include the following:

1. **Curriculum Vitae** (most recent with date) [A template is provided in Bb shell]
2. **Licenses and certifications** (RN, NP, specialty certifications, CPR, etc.)
3. **Honors/Awards**
4. **All previous formal reviews** (i.e., all annual reviews since the last review, reappointment performance reviews, previous promotion, and/or tenure review as relevant)
5. **Letter of support** from the Director of Undergraduate or Graduate Nursing Affairs (and/or Dean, if appropriate)
6. **Teaching**
   a) A narrative statement describing the candidate’s professional career development regarding teaching
   b) A teaching philosophy
   c) General description of courses, other teaching activities, and most up-to-date syllabus for each course taught
   d) **Student course evaluations**: Provide numerical ratings (including a measure of central tendency for each required item), interpretive/contextual statements regarding the students’ evaluations as well as actions taken to enhance teaching effectiveness; course evaluation materials; and all additional evidence such as results of peer evaluations, relevant course materials, and other sources of data related to teaching as noted in Section II
7. **Scholarly Activities**
   a) A narrative statement describing the candidate’s professional career development regarding scholarship. Include a general description of scholarly activities, identified line or focus of research, and a statement of the significance of the scholarly products to the profession.
   b) Copies of publications and other scholarly products such as those noted in Section II.
8. **Service**
   a) A narrative statement describing the candidate’s professional career development regarding service
   b) Evidence of University, school, professional, and community service as noted in Section II
   c) Appropriate letters and other documentation of the scope and quality of such service, including letters from UM-Flint committee chairpersons
9. **External Reviewers**
10. **Additional Information/Documents**
    Additional information or clarification of materials as may be requested from the candidate by the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee.

**General Information:**
1. Narratives should be a maximum of two pages per section, single-spaced, Times New Roman, with one-inch margins.
2. The candidate’s narrative related to scholarship will be sent to the external reviewers as part of the solicitation letter and packet of materials per the established timeline.
3. The three narrative statements, written by the candidate, will be sent to the Provost by the Dean per the established timeline.
4. Materials in each section should be organized consistent with the related narrative statement and organizational format.

E. External Reviewers

Requirements regarding the external review processes are updated and communicated through an annual memorandum by the Provost to be consistent with the evolving requirements of the University of Michigan system.

External reviewers are professionals in the disciplines or fields who possess the expertise to review the candidate’s peer-reviewed scholarly products. External reviewers must be of higher academic rank than the candidate. External reviewers must not have a personal or close professional association with the candidate and, whenever possible, should come from an institution with a similar mission. Emeriti faculty members are not eligible to serve as external reviewers.

1. Identification of External Reviewers
   a) The candidate will provide, in consultation with the Dean and Director, a prioritized list of names, titles, academic ranks, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses of at least twelve (12) possible external reviewers from at least ten (10) different colleges/universities with areas of expertise specific to the candidate’s identified areas of scholarship and or methodology. Included with the list will be a description of each reviewer’s relationship to the candidate and whether an informal discussion about the review occurred. The candidate’s list of external reviewers will include a recommendation of which scholarly materials should be reviewed by which reviewers.
   b) The School (Dean or Director) will identify four to six reviewers which are selected solely by the School without input from the candidate.
   c) The completed list is submitted by the candidate along with an updated CV to the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee through the candidate’s electronic portfolio according to the established timeline.
   d) By the established timeline, the candidate will submit via the electronic portfolio a numbered listing of scholarly materials as well as an electronic copy of the scholarly materials to be sent to the external reviewers.

2. Committee’s Selection of Reviewers
   a) The Tenure and Promotion Review Committee will determine the appropriateness of the reviewers provided by the candidate, will make final decisions regarding distribution of scholarly materials to be sent to each reviewer, and will determine final priority order.
   b) If an insufficient number of acceptable names is provided to the committee, the committee chair will request a list of additional reviewers from the candidate and Dean.
c) The committee chair will provide the final prioritized list of external reviewers to the Dean by the established timeline.

3. **Contact of Reviewers**  
The Dean will make initial contact to ascertain willingness and the ability to provide the service in the stated time frame. A minimum of five external reviewers (six preferred) is needed for the tenure and/or promotion review with at least two of the external reviewers required to be selected solely by the School without input from the candidate.

4. **Letters**  
a) The appropriate template letter(s) outlining the guidelines for the review will be sent by the Dean. The letter(s) will request that the reviewers evaluate the quality and contribution of the candidate’s scholarly products and that they make a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion.

b) A current CV, the candidate’s two-page scholarship narrative statement, and packet of scholarly materials provided by the candidate by the established timeline will accompany the letter to the external reviewers.

E. **Review of Outcomes and Recommendations**

1. **Tenure and Promotion Review Committee**  
The members of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee will review the portfolio and external reviewer letters and prepare summaries of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service for the chair’s use in synthesizing the final committee report. The summaries should be no more than two pages, single-spaced with one-inch margins. The chair will present the final written committee report addressing each of the areas of performance and a recommendation supporting or not supporting tenure and/or promotion to the Dean and to the tenured faculty members of the Executive Committee in accordance with the established timeline. The final summary should be no more than five single-spaced pages with one-inch margins. A signed copy of the TPRC’s report will be submitted to the Provost in accordance with the timeline.

2. **Executive Committee (refers only to the tenured faculty members on the Executive Committee)**  
a) The Executive Committee shall have access to the candidate’s external reviewer letters.

b) The Executive Committee will conduct a review of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee report and recommendation. In the course of their deliberations, the senior-ranked Executive Committee member or designee may invite the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee to provide any clarification as necessary.

c) The Executive Committee will finalize their review of the report and vote on their recommendation to the Dean. The decision/vote regarding tenure and/or promotion shall be made by the tenured faculty members on the Executive Committee in the absence of all other members. The tally of the vote of the Executive Committee with the rationale for their recommendation and their signatures will be conveyed to the Dean.
3. **The Dean**
   a) The Dean will review the faculty candidate’s portfolio, external reviewer letters, the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee’s final report, any supplemental materials forwarded by the Executive Committee, the Executive Committee’s comments, and the Executive Committee’s vote. The Dean may seek clarification from the Executive Committee and/or the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee.
   b) The Dean may or may not be supportive of the Executive Committee’s decision.
      1) If the Dean supports the Executive Committee’s vote to recommend tenure and/or promotion, the decision will be forwarded to the Office of the Provost with the appropriate supporting documents.
      2) If the Dean supports the Executive Committee’s vote not to recommend tenure and/or promotion, the candidate will be provided a terminal year consistent with The University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents and the Standard Practice Guide, or if previously tenured, will remain in the current rank and the Office of the Provost will be notified of the decision.
      3) If the Dean does not agree with the Executive Committee’s vote/recommendation, the reasons shall be explained in writing and both reports will be forwarded to the Office of the Provost.
   c) The Dean will inform the faculty candidate and the Director of Undergraduate or Graduate Nursing Affairs of the outcomes of the review and recommendation regarding tenure and/or promotion and shall make the TPRC’s written report available to the candidate and the Director after Regental approval has been given for a candidate who is being tenured and/or promoted.
   d) Any requests for clarification or information by the faculty candidate related to the written report shall be made directly to the Dean.
   e) The Dean’s Office will ensure that all required elements are submitted to the Office of the Provost by the deadline.

4. **Review by University Officials**
   In order to be implemented as recommended, recommendations of the Dean and the Executive Committee concerning promotion and/or tenure will require the approval of the appropriate University officials. Promotion to the associate professor and professor ranks requires action by the Regents. As appropriate, the Dean shall work with the Provost and Chancellor to prepare Regental communication.

G. **Appeal of Tenure and/or Promotion Recommendation/Decision**

The faculty is expected to initiate an appeal within ten (10) working days of being notified by the Dean of the outcomes of the review and recommendation regarding the request for tenure and/or promotion.

The University and the SON are committed to ensuring that all individuals are treated fairly, are not disadvantaged because of race, ethnicity, gender, age, or other personal traits and characteristics, and that all policies and procedures are followed. If a faculty member feels that he/she has been negatively affected by such mentioned irrelevant characteristics, the
faculty member has the right to appeal such decision through the appropriate University authorities.

A faculty member seeking promotion and/or tenure who is not satisfied on procedural grounds with the decision may initiate an appeal of the performance review. A faculty member may seek the guidance of the Office of the Ombuds and/or appeal the decision to the UM-Flint Grievance Hearing Board as outlined in the University of Michigan-Flint Faculty Grievance Procedure.

H. Confidentiality/Breach of Confidentiality

Confidentiality of data generated for the review process, including the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee and Executive Committee deliberations, will be maintained to the extent that such data are protected by the University of Michigan. Should a breach of confidentiality occur during the process of the committees’ deliberations, the committee will consult with the Dean to determine appropriate action.

I. Resources Associated with the Procedures of Promotion and/or Tenure

The candidate is responsible for assembling the portfolio. Administrative resources may be provided as needed based on availability. The SON Dean’s Office will assume costs of duplication of documents and editing of drafts and/or final reports of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee and Executive Committee.

J. Storage of Documents

The final report(s), including letters from the external reviewers and other select documents generated by the review process, shall be kept by the SON. At the conclusion of the review process (which includes appeals, if any), those documents that are not reproducible (e.g., books, audiovisual materials, etc.) will be returned to the candidate. Records reflecting deliberations of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee and of the Executive Committee, as well as the Blackboard shell for the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee, shall be permanently deleted.

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