College of Engineering Promotion & Tenure Evaluation Process

Professor Alec D. Gallimore
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
Goals of Presentation

• Walk through the timeline of CoE’s P&T process
• Discuss the casebook and its elements
• Highlight matters warranting special attention; e.g., Provost rules
Prelude – Who’s Up?

April/May

- Department chairs and candidates decide if they want to put a case forward this year

  √ Assistant professors in 5th year must come up in 6th year unless tenure delay approved

  √ Associate to Full: 6 years in rank is considered aggressive to be put forward

  √ For unusual cases, the College of Engineering Executive Committee (EC) will review CV and make recommendation to department chair
Appointing the Committee

May/June

• Chair/Candidate proposes Evaluation Committee (Casebook Committee)

• Casebook Committees have three (3) members
  √ Two (2) from inside department
  √ One (1) from outside department

• EC approves or suggests changes
Functions of Evaluation Committee

√ Manage development of casebook
  • Gather information needed to evaluate candidate
  • Ensure casebook is prepared completely and objectively
  • Quality of casebook matters greatly

√ Make first recommendation
  • Here you can be an advocate, based on your findings
Casebook Template

A. Three-page promotion and/or tenure recommendation from the Dean (for Regents communication, but draft prepared by department)
B. Cover letter prepared by the Dean
C. Chair/Department Letters
   a. Letter from Chair (to EC)
   b. Letter from casebook committee to Chair (present findings and recommendation)
   c. Letter from the Casebook Committee to the Candidate
D. Curriculum Vitae
   a. Candidate Information
   b. Teaching
   c. Research
   d. Service
   e. Summary of contributions to teaching, research, service and impact
E. Documentation of Teaching
   E.1 Committee’s Evaluation of Teaching
F. Documentation of Research
   F.1. Committee’s Evaluation of Research and Impact
   F.2. Ranking of Journals
      F.2.1. Candidate’s own ranking of journals
      F.2.2. Committee’s ranking of journals
G. Documentation of Service
   G.1. Committee’s Evaluation of Service
H. Brief Description of Credentials of External Reviewers and Relationship to Candidate
I. Sample Letter Sent to External Reviewers
J. Evaluation Letters by all External Reviewers
K. Evaluation Letters by Internal Reviewers
Appendix – Records of Communications
Outside Letters

June-August

• Goal is for 8-10 external letters
• Candidate submits list (~4-5) of external letter writers
• Committee must identify remaining external letter writers
• Note Provost Rule – minimum of five (5) “arm’s length” letters, two (2) of which must be identified by department/committee*
• Candidate submits CV and selected papers (~4-5) to be sent to outside reviewers to casebook chair
  – CV must follow casebook template and be of very high quality

*http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/procedures.html
Outside Letters (cont.)

• Candidates are entitled to submit a “stop list”
• Letters should not be solicited from names on the “stop list”
• All received external letters must be included in the casebook
• Letters from Ph.D./Postdoc advisors and close collaborators may be included, but these do not count against the minimum of five (5) “arm’s length” letters
  – Often provide good insight into the candidate’s impact and so are useful
  – Overly positive comments are discounted somewhat
  – Negative comments could be very damaging
Definition of “Arm’s Length” from Provost’s Office Website

- Teachers, advisors, mentors, and 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
- 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 and the candidate have not personally interacted in the research effort. In these cases, we ask that departments provide a statement in the reviewer's bio noting the absence of a direct collaboration.
- 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, 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

*http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/procedures.html*
Email to Potential Reviewers

- Candidate prohibited from contact with potential reviewers
- Committee sends email to chosen reviewers
- Three (3) options to choose from for reply:
  - Yes, available to serve as an external reviewer
  - No, unavailable due to time constraints
  - No, candidate’s area is too distant from reviewer’s
- If candidate reviewer responds with “yes,” need to follow up with letter and candidate material
- Please use request letter wording provided in casebook preparation material
  - Other responses might compromise the integrity of the review process
- All email exchanges should appear in casebook appendix
Internal Letters

• Two (2) letters from faculty members
  – Candidate may recommend 2-4 faculty members to committee
  – Candidate may also submit internal “stop list”
  – Unsolicited internal letters are transmitted to the department chair and EC, but are not part of the formal casebook

• Graduate students — A minimum of two (2) letters
  – Candidate may recommend 2-4 students (graduate students and undergraduates)
  – Special attention paid to what students have to say about the candidate as a Ph.D. advisor

• Undergraduate students — A minimum of four (4) letters
  – Faculty candidate will recommend half of the names of undergraduate students
  – The committee, through the department’s advising office, will identify the other half
  – At least one must come from the committee’s list and also must not be a member of the candidate’s research group
  – Letters should be solicited from students at different performance levels and with an eye towards diversity
Information Gathering

July-November

- ADAA provides detailed template for candidate to fill in
- It is not necessary for candidate to fill in every blank to get tenure or promotion!!
  - Intent is that for any valuable activity, there should be a place for it to be recorded in casebook
- Committee needs to gather and verify information
- Be conservative in classifying publications
  - You do not want a “credibility” problem
- If number of citations and H-index are used, please verify these with the candidate
Distillation and Response

October/November

- Committee submits casebook and recommendation to department chair
- Submits to candidate distillation letter of key findings
  - Shall not contain any recommendation
  - Also included in casebook
- Candidate may respond in writing to ADAA with a copy to the department chair
- Department makes decision based on established procedure; e.g., vote by Executive Committee, or Faculty at rank or higher
- Chair forwards department recommendation (and vote) to ADAA by Nov. 16, 2015 (tentative)
- Drafts of the casebooks should be sent to Sherry Hall the week prior to the Nov. 16 due date
December

- ADAA office reviews each casebook, asks for missing information
- Submits casebooks to EC
- Each casebook is assigned one EC member as the lead reviewer
- The EC and ADAA read all casebooks *carefully* over the inter-semester break
Chairs’ Meeting

January/February

• EC deliberates over the casebooks through January and early February, may ask departments for clarification
• EC holds straw-vote and preliminary discussion on each case
• In a joint meeting of chairs, associate deans, and EC members
  – Each case is presented briefly by the department chair
  – EC responds with issues (if any)
  – Case discussed among chairs, ADs and EC
  – Chairs and ADs give advisory vote for EC
• EC makes final decision on recommendation by the end of January or early February
• Candidate informed by ADAA in late February of CoE’s recommendation when communications to the Provost are complete
At the Provost’s Level

February-May

- All tenure cases (positive and negative) and all positive promotion cases go to Provost for review
- Provost appoints a committee to evaluate all casebooks
  - All 2014-2015 CoE promotion recommendations were approved by the Provost (and Regents)
- Recommended cases go to Regents for final approval
- It is official in May once the Regents vote
Please and pleas

- Please do not alter the Word template for casebooks
  - Any changes will result in garbage when processed by the distiller
- Please follow the CV template precisely
  - There should be a place to copy and paste in anything you wish to include
- ADAA staff will add all scanned letters
- Please contact Sherry Hall if you have questions
Acceptable External Letters

• Original, signed letters are preferred
• Letters sent by fax with the appearance of an original signature
• Evaluation letters uploaded to a secure website
• Letters sent by email:
  – If the text is in the body of the email from a university or business email address
  – If the email attachment is accompanied by the original email within which it came (from a university or business email address)
  – If the person only has a personal email address, it will be accepted only if the email is followed by a hardcopy of the letter
External Letters (cont.)

Rare Case

• If a letter is received without a signature and is not delivered electronically, a letter or email message addressed to the ADAA or EC from the casebook committee chair verifying the authenticity of the letter must be included in the casebook.
Research Faculty

• Similar casebook template as T&TT’s, but:
  – More emphasis on research and publications and less on teaching
  – Use OVPR/UMOR guidelines (see ADAA website*)
  – Research scientists evaluated by UMOR
  – Research professors evaluated jointly by UMOR and Provost
    • Independence and non-didactic teaching
  – Will use CoE research faculty promotion criteria starting with AY 2015-2016 casebooks

*http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/
Reappointment

• Same process as P/T but no outside letters

• Winter semester of third year
  – Faculty members who started in January roll into cohort who started that fall; e.g., Jan. 2012 the same as Sept. 2012

• ADAA writes memos reflecting EC comments and offers to meet with candidate