



**Instructions for Faculty Promotions
(Effective for the 2025-2026 promotion cycle)**

GENERAL NOTES

- All promotion recommendations for Instructional Tenure Track, Research Professor Track, and Clinical Instructional Track faculty are reviewed and approved by the Provost and President prior to submission to the Board of Regents.
- **In an effort to manage the ever-growing number of promotion and tenure requests while maintaining the integrity of the process we are requesting units, when possible, to submit casebooks to our office beginning February 4, 2026. The final submission date for all casebooks will be February 11, 2026.**
- **The effective date for University-Year faculty promotions is August 25, 2026.**
- **The effective date for 12-Month faculty promotions is September 1, 2026.**
- The university brings recommendations for promotion in academic rank to the Board of Regents meeting in May 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 at the university. It is also advantageous 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 important to minimize the number of out-of-season promotion requests. Recommendations for promotions outside the normal cycle should be restricted to exceptional 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 following checklist applies 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 Dearborn or Flint. Differences among the tracks are noted in the appropriate sections below.
- All Research Professor Track promotions require the review of the Provost and the Vice President for Research. [Promotions for associate research scientists and research scientists are administered through the Office of the Vice President for Research](#) and do not require approval by the Provost or President.
- The review and signature of the dean of the school/college or unit director are required on all recommended promotions.



- Joint Academic Appointments
 - Our office expects the primary unit to carefully coordinate casebooks for faculty members holding joint appointments in more than one unit with each of the respective units. **This includes dry appointments without effort and joint appointments on different tracks.** Respective units should have a preliminary discussion confirming internal processes, timelines, and agreed upon external reviewers for all appointments. In these instances, the instructional tenure track promotion with JOINT ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS (F-2) template solicitation letter should be used. **The final solicitation letter should include all appointments held by the candidate.** Post hoc reviews and approvals by secondary units after the casebook has been submitted to our office is strongly discouraged.
 - The cover memo for joint appointment casebooks should be signed by all of the appropriate chancellors/deans/directors. This cover letter should describe the processes used in each school/college/unit, as well as a description of the ways in which the two (or more) schools and colleges coordinated promotion processes in the case including each unit's votes. If the individual is not recommended for promotion in any of the units in which the faculty member 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 in the documentation for each candidate will vary across the different faculty tracks. However, all files must include documentation of teaching effectiveness and research or creative work.

- [The University of Michigan Bylaws for Clinical Instructional Staff \(Sec. 5.23\) and for Research Professors \(Sec. 5.24\).](#)

- [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.

- Instructions for Research Scientist promotion recommendations can be found on the Office of Research website:
<https://research.umich.edu/research-resources/research-faculty-affairs/promotion-procedures-for-research-scientists/>

- **NEW THIS YEAR:** For faculty members under consideration for promotion with tenure, upon submission of final casebook materials to the school, they will have the option to list up to three faculty members outside of their unit who should not review the casebook at the provostial level. [Click here to access the Qualtrics Survey.](#) Schools and college contacts should make faculty members aware of this option after submission of final materials. This option solely applies to provostial review of tenure cases and not any review procedures by departments, schools, or colleges.

**CHECKLIST FOR
FACULTY PROMOTION CASEBOOKS
(Effective for the 2025-26 promotion cycle)**

Please upload a bookmarked PDF of the following materials for each casebook to the designated Dropbox folder, when possible, beginning February 4 and no later than February 11, 2026.

Prior to uploading, please be sure the PDF document has been enabled for optical character recognition.

Naming Convention: Last Name, First Name - School/College

For additional information, contact Academic and Faculty Affairs, Office of the Provost,
Provost.Fac.Acad.Affairs.Admins@umich.edu

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.
- For faculty holding joint academic 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 unit Dropbox folder the final summary memorandum as a separate PDF document. [Naming Convention: School Summary Memo Date].

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

- Unit criteria for promotion and tenure for each track (tenure, clinical, research) must be provided by all units and uploaded to the Dropbox folder [Naming Convention: School Track Criteria]
- The criteria must address how your school/college and the various promoting departments, programs, or other units define and evaluate teaching, research, and service. If there are material differences in the criteria used by different areas in your school/college to evaluate candidates, please describe these (e.g., external funding is an important criterion in some disciplines; in others, it is not).

Documentation for each Candidate:

- a. **For Instructional Tenure Track Faculty Only: A Copy of the Promotion Recommendation – see [Instructions for Instructional Faculty Promotion Recommendations and Sample Promotion Recommendation](#)**
 - 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.
 - **When listing publications in the promotion recommendation, please avoid including symbols like asterisks.**

- Prior to obtaining the deans' final signature(s), submit an electronic draft of the Promotion Recommendation to Academic Human Resources (Tammy Deane: trendell@umich.edu) for review.
- The final 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) for clarification.
- Use the naming convention: **Last Name, First Name PR- School/College - May 2026**

b. Cover Letter from the Dean/Director

- **NEW:** [Template letter](#) to be implemented this year if possible; required next year.
- Extended subject line:
 - Candidates name, Empl ID
 - Track
 - Clinical pathway
 - For promotion casebooks from the health science schools and colleges provide an estimate of time (%) dedicated to clinical care. We have noticed this has been less consistently reported as of late, so we ask you to please review and include this information as it is helpful in our review.
 - All current titles
 - 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%),
 - Date of hire
 - 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.
 - Exclusions and Extensions
 - Indicate whether any of the candidate's years of service have been **EXCLUDED** from the tenure clock as per [SPG 201.92](#) for childbirth, dependent care, medical or other reasons approved by the provost; or whether the candidate's time to tenure review has been **EXTENDED** within the school/college for an approved COVID-19 extension. For privacy reasons, please do not provide details of the reason behind medical leave (e.g., HIPAA – the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996). Please **DO INCLUDE** the dates for the respective exclusions or extensions included in this summary. For detailed information please review [Guidelines Regarding UM Policies that Govern Time to Tenure Review](#) available on our webpage.

- o Unit votes
 - Include the number of positive votes, negative votes, and abstentions/recusals for all internal committees (department review, promotion advisory committee, and/or executive committee, etc.)
- **For promotion casebooks from the health science schools and colleges** provide an estimate of time (%) dedicated to clinical care. We have noticed this has been less consistently reported as of late, so we ask you to please review and include this information as it is helpful in our review.
- **For promotion casebooks for clinical track faculty from the Medical School**, please also specify the clinical pathway.
- 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. 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, reviews, and votes 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 the candidate's 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 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 as indicated in the June 18, 2025 memo for Faculty Evaluation. 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.
- Describe the outcome of the promotion review at each stage of evaluation in the unit(s) in which the candidate holds an appointment. 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, all internal deliberations must be provided in detail.**
- **Because abstentions and recusals are treated differently in different unit policies, we expect deans to summarize any reasons for abstention or recusals (departmental affiliation, conflict of interest, and/or actual concerns about the casebook).**
- 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, internal split votes, reviewer concerns, etc.).
- 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 applicable)**

- Please provide any letters or reports from department or division chairs to the dean/director or school/college/unit 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.
- **If teaching evaluation concerns are noted, chair letters should summarize any steps taken to support faculty in their teaching and any ongoing work, as appropriate.**

d. Promotion and Tenure Review Committee Reports (when applicable)

e. 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 mandatory negative tenure cases require an updated curriculum vitae, in addition to the original curriculum vitae. This updated CV, requested by the department, should reflect the candidate’s academic productivity at the time that the casebook is submitted to the provost’s office.**

f. Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness

- While recognizing that different cultures prevail in different units with respect to the nature and 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 [CRLT Occasional Papers: The Teaching Portfolio](#))
- 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 this 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 casebook (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.

- If there are negative teaching evaluations and/or comments from learners, we expect the candidate's teaching statement to indicate how they have reflected on the feedback received and adjusted their teaching methods accordingly. **Chairs and Deans should also document any actions undertaken to support the faculty in their 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 information on required core questions, 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 the candidate’s 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 explained in detail in the [Guidance on the Teaching/Mentoring Criteria for the Research Professor Track on the OVPR website](#).

h. Documentation of Service (if appropriate)

i. Sample of Letter Sent to External Reviewers to Solicit Recommendations

- [Template solicitation letters can be found on the provost office website.](#)
- There are four templates:
 - F-1: Instructional Tenure Track
 - F-2: Instructional Tenure Track with Joint Academic Appointments
 - F-3: Clinical Instructional Track
 - F-4: Research Professor Track.

Schools/colleges/units may add text to the language of each template, however, for legal reasons, cannot delete or change any language included in the template.

- It is the responsibility of the dean/director to ensure that department chairs, or the appropriate equivalent, use one of templates provided.
- Include a copy of the solicitation letter in the casebook.

j. Brief Description of the Credentials of External Reviewers and Relationship to the Candidates ([Sample Alphabetical Listing of External Reviewers Who Provided Letters](#))

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 for 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/unit. 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.

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

- All external review letters received must be included in the casebook.
- 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 all external reviewers ([Sample Alphabetical Listing of External Reviewers Who Provided Letters](#)).
- 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 schools/colleges to stress with 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 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 the reviewer 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 parallels 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 U-M

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 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.

1. 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 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.

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.

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.