

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 the 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.

Board of Regents Bylaws

From Chapter V. The Faculties and Academic Staff

<https://regents.umich.edu/governance/bylaws/chapter-v-the-faculties-and-academic-staff/>

Sec. 5.23. Clinical Instructional Staff (revised June 2001)

Adjunct Clinical Instructional Staff. 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 to support the instructional program. Appointments as adjunct clinical instructional staff are on an annual or shorter basis and are without tenure. Appointment and/or promotion criteria shall be consistent with those for regular instructional staff to the extent applicable.

Adjunct clinical appointments and reappointments are recommended by the appropriate instructional unit and school, college, or division and are approved by the chancellor (Flint or Dearborn) and president.

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

Appointments to the clinical track are for a fixed term, cannot exceed seven years in duration, and may be renewed. Appointment and promotion criteria shall be consistent with those for the regular instructional staff to the extent applicable. Further definition of the rights and responsibilities of clinical faculty, not inconsistent with the Bylaws of the Board of Regents, may be addressed by the bylaws of the academic units.

Clinical appointments, reappointments, and promotions are recommended by the appropriate instructional unit and school, college, or division and are approved by the appropriate provost, chancellor (Flint or Dearborn), and president.

The vice president and secretary of the university shall maintain a list of those schools, colleges, and divisions that are authorized to make appointments to the clinical instructional staff.

Sec. 5.24. Research Scientists and Research Professors (revised October 2003)

Research Scientists. An academic or research unit may appoint research scientists to support the research activities of the university if a policy to authorize such appointments has been adopted by the school, college, division, or research unit in accordance with the bylaws of that unit and has been approved by the vice president for research. Research scientist appointments are not appointments to the tenured or tenure-track instructional faculty. The following titles may be used for research scientist appointments: research scientist, associate research scientist, assistant research scientist, and research investigator. Further definition of the rights and responsibilities of research scientists, not inconsistent with the Bylaws of the Board of Regents, may be addressed by the bylaws of the academic or research units.

Research scientist appointments and promotions are recommended by the appropriate instructional unit and school, college, division, or research unit and are approved by the vice president for research, the chancellor (Dearborn or Flint), and the president.

The vice president and secretary of the university shall maintain a list of those schools, colleges, divisions, and research units that are authorized to make research scientist appointments.

Research Professors. An academic or research unit may appoint research professors to support the research activities of the university if a policy to authorize such appointments has been adopted by the school, college, division, or research unit in accordance with the bylaws of that unit and has been approved by the vice president for research and the appropriate provost. Research professor appointments are not appointments to the tenured or tenure-track instructional faculty. The following titles may be used for research professor appointments: research professor, research associate professor, and research assistant professor. Further definition of the rights and responsibilities of research professors, not inconsistent with the Bylaws of the Board of Regents, may be addressed by the bylaws of the academic or research units.

Research professor appointments and promotions are recommended by the appropriate instructional unit and school, college, division, or research unit and are approved by the vice president for research, the appropriate provost, the chancellor (Dearborn or Flint), and the president.

The vice president and secretary of the university shall maintain a list of those schools, colleges, divisions, and research units that are authorized to make research professor appointments.

Instructions for Instructional Tenure Track Faculty Promotion Recommendations

An outline of the format to be used for promotion recommendations is attached. Each recommendation should be at least three (3) pages, not exceeding five (5) pages. The promotion recommendations for **Instructional tenure track faculty** will be presented to the Regents as electronic files; therefore, we ask that you submit these files electronically to Tammy Deane via the DropBox. The electronic file should be an exact replica of the original printed version (**including** the signature).

The tenure status (with or without) for promotions to associate and full professor must be indicated. Also, if a faculty member has a joint Instructional appointment in your school/college or 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).”

FORMAT FOR PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION FOR INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION

The University of Michigan

SCHOOL/COLLEGE OF _____
DEPARTMENT OF _____

(Name), (Present Instructional Rank), (Complete Instructional Title[s]), with (or without) tenure, (Department or Unit), (School/College) is recommended for promotion to (Recommended Instructional Rank), (Complete Instructional Title[s]), with (or without) tenure, (Department or Unit/School/ College).

(NOTE: This paragraph would not include adjunct, supplemental or professional/ administrative titles the individual might hold. Please include all joint Instructional appointments they may hold within your school/college or other schools/colleges.)

Academic Degrees (List highest degree first, in descending order: e.g., Ph.D., M.S., B.S.)

Professional Record: (Please include all titles held at the University of Michigan, at other universities, and other professional affiliations, with the most current title listed first.)

20__-20__ Associate Professor, University of Michigan
20__-20__ Assistant Professor, University of Michigan
19__-20__ Assistant Professor, other university

Summary of Evaluation:

Teaching:

- Provide a broad assessment of teaching.
- Describe the variety of non-classroom teaching venues that are part of the Instructional environment.
- Explain the significance of the candidate's role in curriculum innovation, initiatives and design.

Research:

- List most significant publications and highlight recent publications (since last promotion). Include a prediction as to the candidate's future productivity and contributions to the discipline, the unit, and the University.
- Carefully explicate the disciplinary and interdisciplinary culture within which the scholarly work is produced.
- Explain the significance of the candidate's role in multiple authorship situations.

Service:

- Provide a general description of the contribution.
- List specific examples.

External Review: Summarize the comments of at least five external peer reviewers. (To maintain the confidentiality of the external peer reviewers, identify the reviewer by using the designation "Reviewer A, B, C," etc. - see Attachment G.)

Summary of Recommendation: Provide an overall assessment of performance and achievements in the context of the mission of the unit.

(Signature - in black ink)
(Name, title of chancellor/dean)
(school/college/campus)

(Signature - in black ink)
(Name, title of chancellor/dean)
(Second signature for joint appointments)

SAMPLE PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION
The University of Michigan
College of Engineering
Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science

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. 1997 University of Illinois, Computer Science, Urbana-Champaign
M.S. 1993 University of Illinois, Computer Science, Urbana-Champaign
B.S. 1991 Duke University, Physics and Computer Science, Durham, NC

Professional Record:

2015 – present Associate Professor (with tenure), Department of Electrical Engineering and
Computer Science, University of Michigan
2000 – 2008 Engineering Manager, Advanced Design Technology, Motorola, Inc., Austin, TX
1998 – 2000 Staff Engineer, Semiconductor Systems Design Technology Group, Motorola, Inc.,
Austin, TX
1997 – 1998 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 2005, he has graduated eight Ph.D. students, with three more expected to graduate before the end of 2016. 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 2009 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 2005, 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 eleven 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:

- Quaker Oats, Steve Sunshine, Dennis Silver, John Doe, "Statistical Interconnect Metrics for Physical-Design Optimization," *Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems (T-CAD)*, Vol. 25, No. 7, July 2015, pg. 1273 - 1288.
- Bruce Lee, Greg Heaven, John Doe, Dennis Silver, "Bus Encoding for Total Power Reduction using a Leakage-Aware Buffer Configuration," *IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration Systems (T-VLSI)*, December 2014, pg. 1376-1383.
- Bo Wrap, John Doe, Dennis Silver, Fish Flunder, "The Limit of Dynamic Voltage Scaling and Insomniac Dynamic Voltage Scaling," *IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration Systems (T-VLSI)*, November 2014, pg. 1239-1252.
- John Lee, John Doe, Dennis Silver, "Static Leakage Reduction through Simultaneous V_{DD} and State Assignment," *Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems (T-CAD)*, Vol. 24, No. 7, July 2013, pg. 1014-1029.
- Steve Sunshine, Brown Bear, John Doe, Dennis Silver, "Parametric Yield Estimation Considering Leakage Variability," ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (DAC), June 2012, pg. 442-447, Best Paper Nomination.
- Dan Neat, Singing Kim, Dave Downtown, Blue Pant, Todd Farm, Steve Sunshine, Conrad Belt, John Doe, Brown Beat, Greg Gray, "Razor: A Low-Power Pipeline Based on Circuit-Level Timing Speculation," ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO), December 2011, pg. 7-18, Best Paper Award.

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 the 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.

Alec D. Gallimore, Ph.D.
Robert J. Vlasic Dean of Engineering
College of Engineering

May 2023

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 and 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 and 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].

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" (Seldin, 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.



CRLT Occasional Papers

—○—

The Center for Research
On Learning and Teaching

—○—

The University of Michigan

—○—

No. 11

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 (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 insure 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.

References

- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Cerbin, W. (1993). Inventing a new genre: The course portfolio at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. In P. Hutchings (Ed.), *Making teaching community property: A menu for peer collaboration and peer review* (pp. 49-56). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Chism, N. V. (1997-1998). Developing a philosophy of teaching statement. *Essays on Teaching Excellence: Toward the Best in the Academy*, 9(3).
- Edgerton, R., Hutchings, P., & Quinlan, K. (1991). *The teaching portfolio: Capturing the scholarship of teaching*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Shulman, L. (1993, November/December). Teaching as community property: Putting an end to pedagogical solitude. *Change*, 6-7.

Seldin, P. (1997). *The teaching portfolio* (2nd ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Shore, B., Foster, S., Knapper, c., Nadeau, G., Neill, N., & Sini, V. (1986). *The teaching dossier: A guide to its preparation and use*. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Association of University Teachers.

Possible items for inclusion

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.
9. Documentary evidence of the effect of courses on student career choice.
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.
24. Attempting instructional innovations and evaluating their effectiveness.

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 or similar body.

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

Note: From *The Teaching Dossier: A Guide to Its Preparation and Use* (pp. 14-23) by B. Shore, S. Foster, C. Knapper, G. Nadeau, N. Neill, and V. Sim, 1986, Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Association of University Teachers. Reprinted by permission.

SUGGESTED FORM FOR PEER REVIEW OF UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING BASED ON DOSSIER MATERIALS

QUESTION	DOSSIER MATERIALS	SUGGESTED FOCUS IN EXAMINING DOSSIER MATERIALS
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 ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Very High		
Comments: _____		

2. What kind of intellectual tasks were set by the teacher for the students (or did the teacher succeed in meeting 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 ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Very High		
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 ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Very High		
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 ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Very High		
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 ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Very High		
Comments: _____		

GF LAZOVIK 1979
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Peer Reviewer's Signature _____

Date _____

Reprinted by permission.

The *CRLT Occasional Papers* series is published on a variable schedule by the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching at the University of Michigan. Information about extra copies or back issues can be obtained by writing to Publications, CRLT, 3300 School of Education Building, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259. This issue was edited by Lisa A. Mets.

Copyright 1998 The University of Michigan

CRLT Occasional Paper No. 11

The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching

The University of Michigan
3300 School of Education Bldg.
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259

Attachment F-1
Instructional tenure track promotion
non-interdisciplinary appointments

SOLICITATION LETTER TEMPLATE

At a minimum, the following language is required:

[Date]

[Name]

[Title]

[Department]

[Institution]

[Street Address]

[City, State, Zip]

Dear Professor [Name]:

The [Unit(s)] at the University of Michigan [is/are] considering [Candidate Name] for promotion from the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure] to the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure]. Faculty at the University of Michigan are promoted on the basis of research, scholarly, and creative contributions; teaching ability; and service. Recognition of the quality of their work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process. We value your candid assessment of [Candidate Name's] research accomplishments and future promise, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Your scholarly and professional judgments will play an important part in our evaluation of [Candidate Name] for promotion.

[ONLY FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY SEEKING TENURE]: Please keep in mind that at the University of Michigan the criteria for the granting of tenure are the same regardless of the length of a candidate's service as an untenured faculty member. [[ADD THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE IF THE SCHOOL/COLLEGE ONLY ALLOWS ONE ATTEMPT AT TENURE: "Also note that, except in rare circumstances, a review for tenure in [Unit] can only occur once."]] We ask that you be attentive to our policies in your evaluation of [Candidate Name].]

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

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

5. How would you evaluate [Candidate Name's] service contributions to the discipline; that is, [his/her/their] work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?
6. Might [his/her/their] work meet the requirements for someone being considered for promotion and, if applicable, tenure at your institution?

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

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

We request that you return your review to us by [Date]. We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise 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 not respond, we will note this in the candidate's promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name]
[Title]

Enclosures

Attachment F-2
Instructional tenure track promotion
interdisciplinary appointments

SOLICITATION LETTER TEMPLATE

At a minimum, the following language is required:

[Date]

[Name]

[Title]

[Department]

[Institution]

[Street Address]

[City, State, Zip]

Dear Professor [Name]:

The [Unit(s)] at the University of Michigan [is/are] considering [Candidate Name] for promotion from the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure] to the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure]. Faculty at the University of Michigan are promoted on the basis of research, scholarly, and creative contributions; teaching ability; and service. Recognition of the quality of their work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process. We value your candid assessment of [Candidate Name's] research accomplishments and future promise, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Your scholarly and professional judgments will play an important part in our evaluation of [Candidate Name] for promotion.

[ONLY FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY SEEKING TENURE]: Please keep in mind that at the University of Michigan the criteria for the granting of tenure are the same regardless of the length of a candidate's service as an untenured faculty member. [[ADD THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE IF THE SCHOOL/COLLEGE ONLY ALLOWS ONE ATTEMPT AT TENURE: "Also note that, except in rare circumstances, a review for tenure in [Unit] can only occur once."]] We ask that you be attentive to our policies in your evaluation of [Candidate Name].]

Based on the enclosed materials and any other knowledge you have of [his/her/**their**] work or professional accomplishments, we would like your candid evaluation of [Candidate Name's] written and scholarly contributions in relation to others of comparable experience in [his/her/**their**] field.

[Candidate Name] is engaged in research that is interdisciplinary in nature. [He/she/they** holds a joint appointment in the departments of [discipline] and [discipline].] We invite your consideration of the interdisciplinary nature of [Candidate Name's] work in your review of [his/her/**their**] scholarly contributions.**

We would appreciate your comments on the following issues:

1. How do you know [Candidate Name]? (in what capacity and for how long?)
2. What are your impressions about the quality, quantity, focus and scholarly impact of the [Candidate Name's] works?

3. Which, if any, of the scholarly publications or works do you consider to be outstanding?
4. How would you estimate [Candidate Name's] standing in relation to others in [his/her/their] peer group who are working in the same field?
5. How would you evaluate [Candidate Name's] service contributions to the discipline; that is, <his/her/their> work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?
6. Might [his/her/their] work meet the requirements for someone being considered for promotion and, if applicable, tenure at your institution?

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

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

We request that you return your review to us by [Date]. We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise 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 not respond, we will note this in the candidate's promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Title]

Enclosures

Attachment F-3
Clinical Instructional track promotion

SOLICITATION LETTER TEMPLATE

At a minimum, the following language is required:

[Date]

[Name]

[Title]

[Department]

[Institution]

[Street Address]

[City, State, Zip]

Dear Professor [Name]:

The [Unit] at the University of Michigan is considering [Candidate Name] for promotion from the rank of Clinical [specify rank] to the rank of Clinical [specify rank] on the clinical instructional track. Faculty at the University of Michigan on the clinical instructional track are promoted on the basis of [any specific responsibilities for clinical instructional track faculty in your specific unit]; contributions to scholarly productivity; teaching ability; and service. Recognition of the quality of their work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process. We value your candid assessment of [Candidate Name's] contributions and future promise, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Your professional judgments will play an important part in our evaluation of [Candidate Name] for promotion.

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

1. How do you know [Candidate Name]? (in what capacity and for how long?)
2. What are your impressions of [Candidate Name's] scholarly and professional work?
3. How would you estimate [Candidate Name's] standing in relation to others in [his/her/their] peer group who are working in the same field?
4. How would you evaluate [Candidate Name's] service contributions to the discipline; that is, [his/her/their] work on regional and/or national professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?
5. Does your institution have a track and rank equivalent to the track and rank in which [Candidate Name] is being considered for promotion? If so, would [Candidate Name] be likely to achieve the equivalent rank at your institution?

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

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

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

We realize that your schedule is full and that this may be a time-consuming task; however, we will be most grateful for your assistance. We have selected you because of your expertise in this area. Should you not respond, we will note this in the candidate's promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Title]

Enclosures

Attachment F-4
Research Professor track promotion

SOLICITATION LETTER TEMPLATE

At a minimum, the following language is required:

[Date]

[Name]

[Title]

[Department]

[Institution]

[Street Address]

[City, State, Zip]

Dear Professor [Name]:

The [Unit] at the University of Michigan is considering [Candidate Name] for promotion from the rank of Research [specify rank] to the rank of Research [specify rank] on the research professor track. Faculty at the University of Michigan on the research professor track are promoted on the basis of research, scholarly, and creative contributions; mentoring; and service. Recognition of the quality of their work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process. We value your candid assessment of [Candidate Name's] research accomplishments and future promise, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Your scholarly and professional judgments will play an important part in our evaluation of [Candidate Name] for promotion.

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

1. How do you know [Candidate Name]? (in what capacity and for how long?)
2. What are your impressions about the quality, quantity, focus and scholarly impact of [Candidate Name's] works?
3. Which, if any, of the scholarly publications or works do you consider to be outstanding?
4. How would you estimate [Candidate Name's] standing in relation to others in [his/her/their] peer group who are working in the same field?
5. How would you evaluate [Candidate Name's] service contributions to the discipline; that is, [his/her/their] work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?
6. Might [his/her/their] work meet the requirements for someone being considered for promotion at your institution?

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

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

We request that you return your review to us by [Date]. We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise 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 not respond, we will note this in the candidate's promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Title]

Enclosures

Attachment G

A. ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF “ARM’S LENGTH” EXTERNAL REVIEWERS WHO PROVIDED LETTERS

Padme Amidala (Reviewer A.) Associate Professor of History and Women's Studies and Affiliate in Galactic Studies at University of Naboo. Professor Amidala is one of the most compelling historians exploring space, particularly in relation to Naboo history. Among her many articles is “Mapping the landscape and suns of Tatooine” in the *Journal of Galactic History*. **(arm’s length – suggested by the department)**

Poe Dameron (Reviewer B.) Director of the Galactic History Project and Professor of the Humanities at Saturn University. Professor Dameron is the resident historian of the Galactic Institute National Historic Site. As the Director of the Saturn History Project, he is at the helm of the most comprehensive project documenting history in our universe. He is a former president of The Force Awakens Project at Mechanical State University, Saturn’s land-grant school under the Habitat Act. **(arm’s length – suggested by the department)**

Qui-Gon Jinn (Reviewer C.) Professor of Landscape Architecture at the University of Galactic Republic and Fellow of the Republic Society of Landscape Architecture. Professor Jinn is co-editor of *Landscape and Space*, 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)**

Hans Solo (Reviewer D.) Professor Emeritus of Landscape Architecture at Corellia University and is the leader of the Rebel Alliance and was named a Fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architects. He headed a team that authored the report that led to the Corellia campus designation as a national historic site. **(arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)**

Jedi Yoda (Reviewer E.) Professor Emeritus of Architecture, Dagobah Institute of Technology. Professor Yoda has been one of the pioneers of criticism in architecture. He co-founded the Neptune School of Planning and Architecture. Among his many publications is his book, *An assessment of the environmentally friendly*. **(arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)**

Attachment G

B. ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF “NON-ARM’S LENGTH” EXTERNAL REVIEWERS WHO PROVIDED LETTERS

Mon Mothma (Reviewer F.) Associate Professor of Urban Design and Planning, College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning at the University of Mars. Professor Mothma is one of the most vigorous scholars at the cutting edge of architectural discourse. The author of the highly praised *Post-modern Municipals* (published by BlackInk Press and reissued by Prince Harry Architectural Press) has helped to bridge the gap between architectural discourse and contemporary cultural criticism. **Professor Mothma is co-author on several articles with the candidate. (non-arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)**

Bail Organa (Reviewer G.) Professor of Landscape Architecture and former Dean of the School of Environmental Design at the University of Milky Way. Professor Organa was a founding editor of *Landscaper’s Royal Journal*, the foremost journal in the field. He is a Fellow of the Galactic Senate Society of Landscape Architects. **Professor Organa was the candidate’s mentor. (non-arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)**

C. ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FROM WHOM LETTERS WERE REQUESTED BUT WHO DECLINED AND THE REASONS FOR DECLINING

Lando Calrissian (Reviewer H.) Professor Calrissian declined because of his limited knowledge of the candidate’s work. He is Professor of Law at Chewbacca 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 2017 from the Republic Publishers Association. **(arm’s length – suggested by the department)**

Obi-Wan Kenobi, Jr. (Reviewer I.) Professor Kenobi declined because of a lack of time due to a family emergency. He is the Jedi Professor of Law at Yavin University, where he teaches property and legal history. He was previously a member of the University of Stewjon 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)**

Leia Organa (Reviewer J.) Professor Organa declined because she is out of the country. She is the Ewok Professor of Law and Organization at Tatooine Law School, where she teaches property, contracts, environmental law, land use planning, and natural resources law. She was previously on the faculties of Hoth Law School, University of Bespin, Northern Lights University, and University of Corellia. 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)**

Luke Skywalker (Reviewer K.) Professor Skywalker did not respond to numerous email requests. He is the Jar Jar Binks Professor Emeritus of Law at Alderaan University where he taught courses in jurisprudence and legal theory. He was previously a member of faculty of the University of Endor, School of Law. He is the author of a book on the theory of private property. **Professor Skywalker was the candidate’s thesis advisor. (non-arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)**

Standard Practice Guide Policies

Rules Concerning Regents' Bylaw 5.09, Tenure, Tenure Review, and Joint or Partial Tenure Appointments 201.13

Applies to: Regular Instructional Staff

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.

I. 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 (II.A) 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.⁴ 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:

1. in residence at the University of Michigan; or
2. on paid duty off-campus (SPG 201.90); or
3. 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
4. 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.⁵

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's⁶ ninth year of university appointments,⁷ with the expectation that one (and only one) additional year⁸ 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,⁹ 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 31st 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*.¹⁰

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 31st of the penultimate year of the school or college's probationary period.¹¹ 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
(http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/tenure_review/policies.html).
(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 initiate 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 evaluation¹³ 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 Appointments¹⁴

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."¹⁵ 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,¹⁶ or given the option to have a second review under school or college policies.¹⁷ 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 leaves¹⁸ 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).
- ¹³ See “Principles for Tenure Review” [http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/tenure_guidelines.pdf (http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/tenure_guidelines.pdf)].
- 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 (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.
- ¹⁸ 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; SPG 201.30-6, Paid Maternity (Childbirth) and Parental Leaves.)

File Attachments

Printable PDF of SPG 201.13, Rules Concerning Regents’ Bylaw 5.09, Tenure, Tenure Review, and Joint or Partial Tenure Apmt (https://spg.umich.edu/sites/default/files/policies/201x13_0.pdf)

SPG Number: 201.13	Applies To: Regular Instructional Staff
Date Issued: November 1, 1993	Owner: Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
Last Updated: September 1, 2018	Primary Contact: Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
Next Review Date: September 24, 2020	

Related Policies:

Notice of Non-reappointment (/policy/201.88)

Paid Maternity (Childbirth) and Parental Leaves (/policy/201.30-6)

Unpaid Leaves of Absence (Instructional) (/policy/201.30-1)

Related Links:

Regent Bylaw 5.09 (<http://www.regents.umich.edu/bylaws/bylaws05a.html>)

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.

© 2019 The Regents of the University of Michigan

Sec. 5.09. Procedures in Cases of Dismissal, Demotion, or Terminal Appointment for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (revised May 2020)

The procedures prescribed in this section shall be followed before recommendation is made to the Board of Regents of dismissal or demotion of:

1. a tenured faculty member; or
2. a tenure-track faculty member during the term of their appointment; or
3. a tenure-track faculty member who has held appointments with the University for a total of ten years in the rank of full-time instructor or higher.

A recommendation of dismissal, demotion, or terminal appointment may be made on the basis of demonstrated misconduct in teaching or research, substantial and manifest neglect of duty, and/or personal conduct that substantially impairs the individual's fulfillment of institutional responsibilities; this includes acts involving moral turpitude or professional or scholarly misconduct. This recommendation must be supported by clear and convincing evidence, subject to the procedures contained in this Bylaw. The process should never be employed to enable harassment or persecution for political or religious belief, or on the grounds of racial, gender, or sexual identity, or any other form of prohibited discrimination, or the diminishment of academic freedom and free speech.

In cases where it is not possible to continue the appointment of a tenured faculty member due to program discontinuation as provided in the university's policy on discontinuance of academic programs, the procedures under this Bylaw are applicable.

Initiation of Proceedings. Proceedings that 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. Before initiating proceedings under this Bylaw, the president, the provost, and executive authority of the unit must all be notified in writing and the president shall refer the case to SACUA. In exceptional cases, where the alleged misconduct of a faculty member as presented in the complaint threatens direct and immediate injury to one or more members of the University community or to the essential functions of the University, the president may direct that the affected faculty member be relieved of some or all of his/her/their university duties and responsibilities, without prejudice and without loss of compensation except as provided below, pending the final disposition of the case.

Suspension of Pay. In cases in which the president has relieved the affected faculty member of some or all his/her/their duties under this Bylaw, and a basis for the initiation of dismissal proceedings is that the affected faculty member has been charged with or convicted of a felony involving violence, including but not limited to, murder, manslaughter, rape, robbery, aggravated assault (or the attempt to commit any of these offenses), the president may invoke this pay suspension process to suspend the affected faculty member's pay during the pendency of the dismissal proceeding. The president may also invoke the pay suspension process in cases of job abandonment.

The pay suspension process may be invoked at the time the president relieves the faculty member of some or all of his/her/their duties, or at a later point in the proceeding, but may not be invoked more than once. Further, no other steps under this Bylaw are delayed by the steps in the pay suspension process.

To initiate the pay suspension process, the president will appoint a committee of three (3) tenured faculty members at or above the rank of the affected faculty member to advise on the question of pay suspension,

after consulting with SACUA and the executive authority of the administrative unit regarding the membership of the Committee. The president will inform the affected faculty member of the committee membership.

Coincident with appointing the Pay Suspension Committee the president will provide the affected faculty member and the Pay Suspension Committee all evidence upon which the president is relying for the pay suspension determination. Within seven (7) days of receipt of this information, the affected faculty member shall provide to the Pay Suspension Committee all information the affected faculty member wishes the Pay Suspension Committee to consider.

The Pay Suspension Committee will have seven (7) days from receipt of all information to provide the president and the affected faculty member with its written recommendation as to whether there is clear and convincing evidence that the affected faculty member either (1) committed the violent crime identified as a basis for the initiation of dismissal proceedings under this Bylaw, or (2) abandoned his/her/their job such that pay should be suspended. The affected faculty member will have seven (7) days to provide a written response to the Pay Suspension Committee's recommendations. Within five (5) days of receipt of the affected faculty member's response, the president will determine whether pay will be suspended and the effective date of pay suspension.

In the event pay is suspended, the affected faculty member will continue to receive the same university contributions to health, dental, and vision insurance as those that were in place prior to pay suspension. In addition, if the proceedings under this Bylaw do not result in dismissal, the faculty member shall receive all compensation he/she/they would otherwise have received during the period of pay suspension.

The university will not disclose the pay suspension decision, nor the recommendation of the Pay Suspension Committee, to the Hearing Committee.

Proceedings.

1. Notice of Charges and Hearing Committee Members. Immediately upon the referral of a case to SACUA, the affected faculty member shall be given written notice in the form of a Charge Letter, stating with reasonable particularity the charges (as prepared by the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs or executive authority of the administrative unit). Not later than seven (7) days after receipt of the notice, the affected faculty member has the right to request a hearing before a Hearing Committee to be appointed by SACUA. Not later than seven (7) days after the affected faculty member has requested a hearing, SACUA must appoint and provide the affected faculty member with the names of a Hearing Committee, which will consist of five (5) tenured faculty at rank or above rank of the affected faculty member, with three (3) from a Standing Judicial Committee appointed by SACUA and two (2) from a list provided by the administrative unit of the affected faculty member. The affected faculty member may, with clear and sufficient reasons for potential bias, request the removal and replacement of one or more members of the Hearing Committee. Any such request shall be made by the affected faculty member, and resolved by SACUA, within seven (7) days of the day the affected faculty member receives the names.

1. Submission of Evidence. The provost and executive vice president for academic affairs or the executive authority (dean, director, or executive committee) of the school, college, or other unit shall present all evidence to be used at the hearing to the affected faculty member within seven (7) days of the issuance of the Charge Letter. The affected faculty member shall present to the provost or executive authority all evidence to be used at the Hearing within 30 days after receiving those materials.

2. **The Hearing.** Under ordinary circumstances, the Hearing Committee shall conclude the hearing no later than 58 days after the issuance of the Charge Letter, or 21 days after the affected faculty member presents to the provost or executive authority all evidence to be used at the Hearing, whichever occurs sooner. The provost and executive vice president for academic affairs, or a representative, as well as the executive authority of the administrative unit in which the affected faculty member is employed, or a representative, may be present at the committee hearing, and may present such evidence as was submitted prior to the hearing, as described in 2. herein. In addition, they may (1) have an adviser of their 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; (4) examine documentary evidence received by the Hearing Committee, and may present such evidence as was submitted prior to the hearing, as described in 2. herein. If they wish to make any recommendations, they shall make them to the Hearing Committee prior to the conclusion of the hearing, whereupon such recommendations shall become a part of the Hearing Committee's record in the case. 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; (4) examine documentary evidence received by the Hearing Committee; and may present such evidence as was submitted prior to the hearing, as described in 2. herein. A full record of the hearing shall be taken.
3. **Written Report of Hearing Committee's Recommendation.** The Hearing Committee shall file a written report with SACUA, the affected faculty member, the Executive Authority of the affected faculty member's unit, the provost, and the president within 14 days of completion of the hearing. The report shall contain the Hearing Committee's conclusions, recommendations, and the reasons therefor. If dismissal, demotion, and/or terminal appointment are 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 Hearing Committee and a transcript of the record of any hearings conducted by the Hearing Committee.
4. **SACUA Review of the Hearing Committee Report.** If the Hearing Committee recommends that adverse action be taken against the affected faculty member, SACUA shall immediately advise the affected faculty member that they may request, within five (5) days, that SACUA review the proceeding conducted by the Hearing Committee. If the affected faculty member requests a review, in conducting this review, SACUA 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, and (4) whether the weight of the evidence, as it appears in the record, supports the Hearing Committee's findings and recommendations. This review will be based solely on the full record of the Hearing Committee's proceedings. In determining its recommendation, SACUA shall be free to make any recommendation appropriate to its findings and conclusions respecting either the procedural or substantive aspects of the case. The faculty member, either in person or through a representative or both, shall have the right to appear before SACUA and to comment on the Hearing Committee's proceeding. A full record shall be kept of the SACUA review. This hearing will take place within 21 days of the request for review from the affected faculty member.

Attachment I

5. SACUA Report. A written report of the conclusions made by SACUA, together with the record of the 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 within seven (7) days of the completion of the SACUA review hearing. SACUA may also include its comments on the Hearing Committee's findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
6. If dismissal is recommended. The affected faculty member, the executive authority of the administrative unit, and the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs may, within seven (7) days after receiving copies of the SACUA report and the record, file written comments with the president.
7. If dismissal is not recommended or if the affected faculty member does not request a SACUA review. The affected faculty member, the provost and executive vice president for academic affairs and/or the executive authority of the administrative unit may, within seven (7) days after receiving the Hearing Committee report, file written comments with the president.
8. President's Recommendation and Parties' Response. The president shall thereafter review the record in the case and shall formulate his/her/their own recommendations and the reasons therefor within seven (7) days of receiving the parties' written comments. The full record of the case, including the recommendations of the president shall then be transmitted by the president to the board for final action. All parties to the proceeding shall receive copies of the president's recommendations.
9. Removal of Tenure/Dismissal or Demotion shall be discussed and voted upon no later than the next regularly scheduled board meeting for which all materials have been provided.