

## Outline of Procedures for Faculty Promotions (Effective for the 2022-2023 academic year)

---

### GENERAL NOTES:

- All promotion recommendations for Instructional Tenure track faculty, Research Professor track faculty, and Clinical Instructional track faculty are reviewed by the Provost and President prior to submission to the Board of Regents.
- Please upload a bookmarked PDF to Dropbox by **Wednesday, February 8, 2023**.
- **The effective date for these promotions will be September 1, 2023.**
- To the extent possible, the University brings all recommendations for promotion in academic rank to the Board of Regents in May of each year. In addition to reviewing individual promotions for Instructional Tenure track faculty, this affords the Regents an opportunity to review the overall promotional pattern for faculty in the University. It is also desirable for promotions to be considered by the various units in a group to ensure that a common frame of reference will be used in making decisions. It is therefore important to minimize the number of out-of-season promotions. Recommendations for promotions outside the normal cycle should be restricted to exception cases and/or circumstances, which are to be explained in the cover letter accompanying the file. Please note that, given the challenges of managing out of season promotions, the timeline for disposition of such cases cannot be guaranteed.
- The attached instructions apply to Instructional Tenure track, Research Professor track, and Clinical Instructional track faculty promotions, all of which require approval by the Provost and the President, and approval by the appropriate Chancellor for Flint or Dearborn faculty. Differences among the tracks are noted in the appropriate sections below.
- All Research Faculty promotions also require the review of the Vice President for Research.
- Promotions for Associate Research Scientists and Research Scientists require the approval of the Vice President for Research and do not require the Provost's or President's approval.
- All Medical School promotions must also have the endorsement of the Executive Vice President for Medical Affairs.
- The review and signature of the Dean of the school/college or Director of an institute are required on all recommended promotions.
- Promotion recommendations for individuals holding joint regular (not adjunct) Instructional Tenure track, Research Professor track, or Clinical Instructional track faculty appointments should be coordinated. They require the signatures of the Chancellor/Deans/Directors from all campuses/schools/colleges where the individual holds instructional appointments, even if those are dry appointments. **Only one casebook should be prepared for a faculty member with joint appointments.** The cover letter for each joint appointment casebook should be signed by all the appropriate Chancellor/Dean(s)/Director(s). This letter should describe the processes used in each school or college to reach a promotion recommendation, as well as a description of the ways in which the two (or more) schools and colleges coordinated their promotion processes in this case. If the individual is not recommended for promotion in any of the units in which he/she/they holds an appointment, the cover letter should clearly indicate the reason(s) for this decision.

- The relative weighing, and hence the detail required, for each of the items (a-1) in the documentation for each candidate (Item #3) will vary across the different faculty tracks. However, all files must include documentation of teaching effectiveness and of research or creative work.
- A copy of the University of Michigan Bylaws for Clinical Instructional Staff (Sec. 5.23) and for Research Professors (Sec. 5.24) is attached for your information (Attachment B).
- **SPG 201.13 – Rules Concerning Regents’ Bylaw 5.09, Tenure, Tenure Review, and Joint or Partial Tenure Appointments – and Regents’ Bylaw 5.09 - Procedures in Cases of Dismissal, Demotion, or Terminal Appointment for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty – are also attached for your information (Attachments H and I).**
- Instructions for Research Scientist promotion recommendations can be found on the Office of Research website: <https://www.research.umich.edu/promotion-procedures-research-scientists>.

**CHECKLIST FOR  
FACULTY PROMOTION CASEBOOKS**

Please upload a bookmarked PDF file of the following materials for each casebook to the designated  
Dropbox folder by Wednesday, February 8, 2023

For further information,  
Contact Academic and Faculty Affairs, Office of the Provost,  
[Provost.Fac.Acad.Affairs.Admins@umich.edu](mailto:Provost.Fac.Acad.Affairs.Admins@umich.edu) or 764-0151.

\*\*\*\*\*

**1. Summary Memorandum from Dean/Director**

- The Dean/Director should include a summary memorandum indicating the names of all individuals being recommended for promotion and the promotion action.
- For a Research Professor track appointment, the summary memorandum from the Dean/Director should be addressed to both the Provost and the Vice President for Research.
- The summary memorandum must include an Employee ID number for each individual being recommended for promotion.
- For faculty holding joint appointments (including Instructional Tenure track, Research Professor track, and Clinical Instructional track appointments), please include details of the recommendation from each unit in which they hold an appointment.
- Please upload to the Dropbox folder the signed summary memorandum as a separate PDF document.

**2. Unit Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service**

- Address how your school/college and the various promoting departments, programs, or other units define and evaluate teaching, research, and service in their areas. If there are material differences in the criteria used by different areas in your school/college to evaluate candidates for promotion, please describe these (e.g., external funding is an important criterion in some disciplines; in others, it is not).

**3. Documentation for each Candidate:**

**a. For Instructional Tenure Track Faculty Only: A Copy of the Promotion Recommendation – see Attachment C (format) and Attachment D (samples)**

- This document, which is prepared for the Regents, should present a brief assessment of the overall performance and achievements of the individual being recommended.
- Include information about the individual's contribution in the context of the unit's mission.
- Prior to obtaining the Dean/Directors' final signature(s), submit an electronic draft of the Promotion Recommendation to Tammy Deane ([trendell@umich.edu](mailto:trendell@umich.edu)) for review.
- The signed Promotion Recommendation should be uploaded to the Promotion Recommendation Dropbox folder. If you have questions, please contact Tammy Deane in Academic Human Resources (936-8911 or [trendell@umich.edu](mailto:trendell@umich.edu)) for clarification.
- Put the date "**May 2023**" at the end of this document.

## b. Cover Letter from the Dean/Director

- Provide a subject line with the candidate's name, all current titles, Employee ID number, and include the date of hire for all cases.
- If the candidate holds joint appointments, please indicate the fraction of effort for each title – for example, Associate Professor, without tenure (100%), and Research Associate Professor (0%).
- Indicate both the total years in rank for the current appointment and the years in rank at Michigan. Please note that to be consistent among all schools/colleges, the years in rank should include the year of the promotion review.
- Time in rank is not prescriptive; putting faculty forward for promotion should be based on individual achievements. Likewise, units should ensure that approved tenure clock extensions or exclusions are not counted against a candidate.
- **Indicate whether any of the candidate's years of service have been excluded from the tenure clock for childbirth, dependent care, or medical or other reasons approved by the provost; or whether the candidate's time to tenure review has been extended for an approved Covid-19 extension within the school/college. For privacy reasons (e.g., HIPAA – the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996), please do not provide details of the reason behind a medical leave.**
- Where appropriate, for promotion casebooks from the health sciences schools and colleges provide an estimate of time (%) dedicated to clinical care.
- The assessment should be written from an evaluative, not an advocacy, perspective and should present a balanced summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the case. Be sure to discuss any negative reports or reviews included in the casebook.
- Provide a 2-3 sentence assessment on what substantive impact the candidate's research or scholarly work has had either within their own field or more broadly.
- It is important that non-traditional forms of scholarly production are given as much scrutiny as the more traditional/disciplinary work. It is important to ensure that individuals receive full credit for their contributions to interdisciplinary and/or collaborative scholarly projects.
- As appropriate, please account for any entrepreneurial, outreach, or creative activities in which faculty engage that may enhance the criteria on which faculty are measured – teaching, research, and service. These activities may include involvement with other sectors, including public or private organizations, that have not traditionally been considered in faculty evaluations, or they may include creative activity that does not take the form of traditional scholarship.
- Dean's letters should focus on pros and cons, strengths and weaknesses, of the case and account clearly for the tenor of the unit's discussion and voting.
- Describe the outcome of the promotion review at each stage of evaluation in the unit(s) in which the candidate holds an appointment. We understand that all cases require careful consideration of strengths and weaknesses; please summarize the evaluative comments of each unit's promotion review committee and/or executive committee and include the final vote tally without names, such as 4-2-0 (i.e., # of positive votes-# of negative votes-# of abstentions/recusals) of any faculty group (department review, promotion advisory committee, and/or executive committee) that voted on the promotion recommendation. If a departmental vote is reversed or a recommendation rejected by the school/college, explain the reversal or rejection in detail.
- Explain your reasons for recommending or not recommending promotion and tenure.
- Highlight and discuss in detail any special circumstances concerning the casebook of this individual (e.g., early promotion request).
- When quoting from an external reviewer, identify as Reviewer A, B, or C, etc. Be sure to exclude identifying information (e.g., the reviewer's institution).
- The cover letter should be signed by the Dean(s)/Director(s) from all units in which the candidate is being promoted.

**c. Chair's letter (if any)**

- Please provide any letters or reports from department or division chairs to the Dean/Director or school/college recommending a decision for or against promotion. If the recommendation is at odds with the decision of a sub-unit or a review committee, that should be explained.
- Also required for secondary appointment recommendations, with or without tenure.

**d. Curriculum Vitae**

- Check the accuracy, completeness, and timeliness of the information in the curriculum vitae, (e.g., that publications listed as “in press” are really in press and that the degrees indicated have been awarded).
- All negative mandatory tenure cases require an updated curriculum vitae, in addition to the original CV. (i.e., a CV that has been updated to reflect the candidate's academic productivity at the time of the provost's level of review).

**e. Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness**

- While recognizing that different cultures prevail in different units with respect to the nature and the evaluation of teaching, the University places a high value on providing students with an outstanding educational experience. We strongly encourage units to develop and utilize teaching portfolios. (See Attachment E for an explanation of teaching portfolios.)
- If the unit chooses to include copies of course syllabi, include no more than two courses.
- Teaching evaluations (i.e., E&E evaluations) should be summarized in this section. A template is provided below for reference. Please note, some version of the template should be included in each casebook.
  - Please display each E&E question that schools, colleges, and academic units ask (i.e., core, required, and optional questions) for each faculty member in its own column in the table submitted with that faculty member's T&P case (see, e.g., template table below). Please also display responses for each question in individual rows for each term's courses and sections of courses (e.g., more than one row will be needed in the event a faculty member has teaching roles in multiple sections of a single course in a single term). Finally, and for each optional question asked, please include a brief explanation for its inclusion.
  - A summary evaluation sheet listing all questions for each course may also be included, as well as other information (e.g., averages for particular E&E questions). In addition, comparative data is particularly helpful. However, these materials are supplemental to, and not replacements for, the information in the tables.
  - Do not include individual student feedback from the E&E forms, though we reserve the right to request individual evaluations by students. Student letters solicited by an evaluating committee can be helpful, but letters solicited by the candidate from students are not helpful. Peer evaluations following observation of classes should be included if they exist.
- If the candidate has not taught formal classes and if teaching evaluations are not available for a promotion on the Research Professor track, provide 3-5 letters from mentees, not currently under the candidate's supervision (e.g., former post-doc students), who can provide feedback on the candidate's teaching.

## TEMPLATE:

### Courses Taught at U-M and Evaluations

- Prior to FA16 evaluations included four (4) required “core” questions:
  - Q1 – Overall, this was an excellent course;
  - Q2 – Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher;
  - Q3 – I learned a great deal from this course; and
  - Q4 – I had a strong desire to take this course
- Beginning September 1, 2016, Q4 continued as a core question. However, Q1, Q2, and Q3 were replaced effective FA16 as “core” questions by the following seven (7) questions, taken from the Registrar’s Office Question Catalog:
  - Q891 (Modified) – As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was... (SA = Much Lighter, A = Lighter, N = Typical, D = Heavier, SD = Much Heavier);
  - Q1631 – This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter (Q1631 was specifically intended to replace Q3);
  - Q1632 – My interest in the subject has increased because of this course;
  - Q1633 – I knew what was expected of me in this course;
  - Q230 – The instructor seemed well prepared for class meetings;
  - Q199 – The instructor explained material clearly; and
  - Q217 – The instructor treated students with respect.
- While they are no longer part of the core set, Q1 and Q2 were required through SU21.
- Beginning Fall 2021, Q1 and Q2 became optional.
- For more information, please visit the Office of the Registrar website:  
<https://ro.umich.edu/faculty-staff/teaching-evaluations>
- Winter 2020 course evaluations will not be reported at the university level but may be reported through individual school or college reporting systems at the discretion of the dean. The Winter 2020 course evaluations will be shared with instructors and used for developmental learning; however, they will not be considered as part of the promotion and tenure decisions.
- Please include the candidate’s own teaching statement.
- For faculty with relevant activities, please comment on their contributions to interdisciplinary teaching.
- All files, whether for Instructional Tenure track, Research Professor track, or Clinical Instructional track, must provide evidence of teaching effectiveness. Where teaching takes place outside the traditional classroom, explain the context in which it occurs and how it is evaluated in terms of both quantity and quality.
- The relevant criterion of teaching effectiveness for the ranks of Research Professor and Research Associate Professor is: Record of teaching and mentoring within the context of one or more research programs (e.g., laboratory bench science, social science, or other disciplinary setting) with postdoctoral fellows, junior research colleagues, or students at any level. Teaching and mentoring are measured in two ways: 1) Quantity (i.e., that there should be evidence of a significant amount of teaching and/or mentoring), and 2) Quality (i.e., that the teaching and/or mentoring done by the individual is effective and has significant impact on the students, fellows, and colleagues being taught). Documentation/evidence to support a candidate’s account of teaching and mentoring activities will vary, depending on the nature of the individual’s activities, *but documentation of quantity and quality must be included*. In all cases, students and mentees include, but are not limited to, undergraduate students, graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and junior research colleagues.

**E&E Template Table** (revise as needed to include E&E questions asked)

Course #	Course Title	Teaching Role*	Term	Enrollment/ Responses (#s only)	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 199	Q 217	Q 230	Q 891	Q 1631	Q 1632	Q 1633

\*Instructor or Co-Instructor

**f. Documentation of Research (if appropriate) or Creative Work (if appropriate)**

- Please provide a brief description of the candidate’s most significant research finding or creative contributions. Keep in mind that this will be read by non-specialists and needs to be accessible to a broad audience. Convey a sense of the candidate’s subfield of scholarship or artistic expression and of the candidate’s place within that subfield. This discussion should enable the reader to understand the substance of the work and its importance. Potentially relevant topics include conventions of publication in the field, sources of external funding, expectations about co-authorship in research teams, norms about work with doctoral and post-doctoral mentors, significance of awards, and other topics as appropriate.
- For those faculty who engage in collaborative research, it is essential that schools/colleges document in the faculty member’s casebook their specific expertise and contribution(s) to collaborative research that indicate research independence.
- For faculty with interdisciplinary appointments, please comment on their contributions to interdisciplinary activities with regard to research.
- For faculty with entrepreneurial, creative, and outreach activities, please comment on their contributions to these types of activities.
- Please include the candidate’s own research statement.
- Include reviews of the candidate’s research or creative work by internal or departmental committees (e.g., ad hoc committee, casebook committee, and/or promotion and tenure committee) and the candidate’s response to the reviews, if any.
- Do not include copies of the original work, such as portfolios of drawings and photos, journal articles, other manuscripts, CDs, or DVDs (note: copies of any reviews of the candidate’s books are acceptable). Do not include copies of grant applications.

**g. Documentation of Service (if appropriate)**

#### **h. Sample of Letter Sent to External Reviewers to Solicit Recommendations**

- Include a copy of the solicitation letter. See the text in the attached template (Attachments F-1 and F-4) that at a minimum must be used. Schools and colleges may add text to the language of the template, however, for legal reasons, cannot delete or change any language. It is the responsibility of the Dean/Director to ensure that department chairs, or the appropriate equivalent, follow one of the templates provided.
- There are four templates: one for an Instructional Tenure track candidate who does not have interdisciplinary appointments (Attachment F-1), and one for an Instructional Tenure track candidate who does have interdisciplinary appointments, which highlights promotion considerations based on interdisciplinary research (Attachment F-2). There are also templates for Clinical Instructional track candidates (Attachment F-3) and for Research Professor track candidates (Attachment F-4).

#### **i. Brief Description of the Credentials of External Reviewers and their Relationship to the Candidates (Attachment G)**

In this section of the casebook, include a cover sheet that includes the following:

- A. A listing of “arm’s length” external reviewers who provided review letters.
- B. A listing of “non-arm’s length” external reviewers who provided review letters.
- C. A listing of external reviewers who were asked to write a letter but declined and the reason for declining.

For the above three categories:

- List all external reviewers alphabetically by last name.
- Identify all external reviewers in sequence as Reviewer A, B, C, D, E, etc.
- Include a brief bio on each reviewer.
- Designate each reviewer as “arm’s length” or “non-arm’s length.”
- Note whether the reviewer was suggested by the candidate or by the department.

Our goal is to receive evaluative letters from external reviewers who have been suggested by the candidate and from reviewers who have been suggested only by the department. For the Instructional Tenure track and the Research Professor track, the five “arm’s length” required letters must include at least **two** from reviewers suggested only by the department. Note: this requirement of two external review letters (minimum) suggested only by the department is not applicable to the Clinical Instructional track.

External reviewers should be contacted only by the school/college/department. The candidate should not have contact with the external reviewers.

If a non-academic external reviewer is included as one of the five required “arm’s length” reviewers, provide justification that the title held by the reviewer equates to or is at a level above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered for promotion.

#### **j. Evaluation Letters by all External Reviewers (at least five are required and more are highly desirable)**

- All external review letters received must be included.
- Please insert the abridged version of the reviewer’s biography (i.e., one short paragraph) in front of each external review letter. This is in addition to the required cover sheet listing external reviewers (Attachment G).
- Include the designation of “arm’s length” or “non-arm’s length” and whether the reviewer was suggested by the candidate or by the school/department.



- The external reviewers must hold a rank at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered for promotion. If the circumstances necessitate letters from out-of-rank reviewers, those should be explained.
- In addition to the above rank requirement, the following track requirements apply:
- External reviewers who are tenured faculty can review all promotion casebooks for the Instructional Tenure track, Research Professor track, and Clinical Instructional track.
- External reviewers who are Clinical Instructional track faculty can only review promotion casebooks for the Clinical Instructional track.
- External reviewers who are Research Professor track faculty can only review promotion casebooks for the Research Professor track.
  - Note: If, for example, an external reviewer who is a Clinical Instructional track faculty were to review an Instructional Tenure track casebook, the letter from the reviewer would not be counted as one of the required five “arm’s length” letters.
- There should be no more than two external reviewers from the same institution.
- We urge you to stress with your department chairs, or the appropriate equivalent, that the external letters must be evaluative and at “arm’s length.” Teachers, advisors, mentors, supervisors, or current faculty colleagues are not “arm’s length.” Co-authors and major research collaborators/former faculty colleagues are also not “arm’s length” unless the most recent association occurred over 10 years prior to the promotion. We do not consider letters from persons who have served on a candidate’s thesis or dissertation committee to be “arm’s length.” While these kinds of letters can be especially helpful (because the letter writers can be presumed to have a good sense of both the candidate and the work), it is also true that their own reputations are involved in the work being evaluated. If such letters are included, they must be in addition to the minimum requirement of five “arm’s length” letters. Letters from persons who do not know the candidate, but who may have a clear sense of the significance of the candidate’s qualifications, are of greater value.
- Please note that when both an outside reviewer and the candidate for promotion are members of the same large cooperative/research group that publishes abstracts and manuscripts with an expanded number of co-authors, the outside reviewer can be considered an “arm’s length” reviewer if he/she/they and the candidate have not personally interacted in the research effort. In these cases, we ask that the dean provide a statement noting the absence of a direct collaboration.
- It is important that the Clinical Instructional track parallel the Instructional Tenure track and Research Professor track in that it is the regional/national impact on one’s field that should justify a senior academic rank. However, “arm’s length” letters from persons who do not know the candidate, but who have a clear sense of the significance of the candidate’s qualifications, are unlikely to tell the whole story insofar as teaching and clinical work are concerned. Therefore, it would be reasonable, for Clinical Instructional track faculty only, to have up to two of the five “arm’s length” evaluative letters from University of Michigan faculty who have seen the clinical work and actual teaching but are neither mentors nor scholarly collaborators nor in the same department as the candidate. At least three of the remaining letters would need to be “arm’s length” as ordinarily defined.
- For questions about re-using the previous year’s external review letters from a candidate’s promotion casebook, please contact the appropriate vice provost.

**k. Evaluation Letters by Internal (University of Michigan) Reviewers**

- Internal review letters are not required; but if letters were solicited, they must be included. Internal review letters may be helpful if they are from faculty in other units who can attest to the value of a faculty member’s work, particularly interdisciplinary and clinical work (as noted above) and scholarship.
- **For faculty on the research professor track whose promotion package is based on their contributions to team science, internal non-arm’s length letters from research colleagues**

are strongly encouraged to provide greater clarity regarding the candidate's unique contributions to the collective research.

4. **Retention of Promotion and Tenure Files**

- [SPG 201.46 – Personnel Records - Collection, Retention and Release](#) – requires that promotion and tenure files be retained for a period of six years plus the current fiscal year in each candidate's departmental or unit personnel file.

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

- [SPG 201.35](#) - The University of Michigan is committed to a policy of equal opportunity for all persons and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, marital status, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, disability, religion, height, weight, or veteran status in employment, educational programs and activities, and admissions.

LJP/SBB/daw  
Attachments

Updated July 2022