

Table of Contents

Research Faculty Promotion Guidelines College of Engineering 2018-2019

(<http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/prs-promotions/>)

A. Timetable of Promotion process -----	2
B. Instructions for the Department Chair- -----	5
C. Instructions for the Faculty Candidate- -----	7
D. Instructions for Promotion Committees- -----	9
E. Sample Solicitation Letters-----	12
F. Example Memorandum from Casebook Committee to Candidate -----	16
G. Guidelines for Electronic Submission-----	18
H. Detailed Instructions for Preparation of Casebooks-----	19
I. UMOR Policies on Promotion of Research Faculty -----	30

Website resources

UMOR promotion guidelines:

<http://research.umich.edu/research-faculty/appointments-and-promotions/>

A. TIMETABLE FOR PROMOTION PROCESS

2018

April - July	Casebook committee membership: Formation of committees by Departments and approval of casebook committees by CoE Executive Committee
Friday, April 6	ADAA requests sent to Department Chairs for casebook committees
Tuesday, May 1	Department casebook committee recommendations due to ADAA ADAA sends EC approval of or changes for casebook committees to Department Chairs
June 12	Meeting of P/T Candidates EECS 3316
June 15	Meeting of Casebook Committee Chairs EECS 3316
Mid-late June <i>(projected)</i>	Distribution of promotion and/or tenure materials to Department Chairs, Casebook Committee Chairs, and Casebook candidates. MSWord and Adobe pdf Guidelines and templates on ADAA website: http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/admin/ptr/
Late June	Candidate materials due to Casebook Committee Chair: curriculum vitae, selected papers, list of potential external and internal reviewers
July-September	
August	Casebook Preparers' workshop for staff
Sept. 12	Presentation of CRLT Player's performance of "Tenure Decisions" for committee chairs/members. Johnson Rooms, 2:00-4:00pm.
October-November	Casebook preparation and evaluation. Department deadlines for submission of the casebook to Department Chair will differ but typically this is expected by the end of October. Simultaneously with submission to the department, the casebook committee provides to the candidate a one-page summary presenting the committee's distillation of the casebook. The casebook is then evaluated for departmental recommendation according to department-specific policies and procedures. The candidate may respond, in writing, to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs with a copy to the Department Chair by <u>November 12, 2018</u> .

Monday, November 12 12 noon Submission of electronic and original casebook to the ADAA.

Monday, November 12 Department Chairs inform candidates of the department's decision to recommend or not recommend promotion and/or grant tenure with a copy to the ADAA. If this is done by letter or email, the ADAA should be copied.

2019

January

Executive Committee (EC) discussion of casebooks. The EC will evaluate the casebooks in depth during December 2018 and January 2019. On occasion, the EC raises questions about the casebook and requests the relevant Department Chair to respond with additional information or clarification. The Department Chair, if appropriate, may request feedback from the candidate in order to respond with full information.

Mid-January Communication to Department Chairs requesting responses to questions raised by the EC on candidate casebooks

January-February

Thursday, January 24 All day meeting to discuss promotion/tenure casebooks for tenure track and research-track faculty
(projected)
LEC GM Room

Friday, January 25 Discuss remaining promotion/tenure casebooks
(projected)
LEC GM Room

Wednesday, Feb. 6 Submission of Executive Committee recommendations for promotion and all candidate casebooks to the Provost/UMOR.
(projected)

March

Early March The EC's final decisions will be conveyed to the departments in early March. The Department Chair will inform the candidate of the decision. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs sends a letter to each candidate informing him/her (with a copy to the Department Chairs) of:

- a) Executive Committee recommendation for promotion
- b) Executive Committee decision not to recommend promotion

April-May

Provost/UMOR reviews all casebooks. Approval of recommendations are announced in May.

June

UMOR sends letter to each candidate who has received promotion and/or granted tenure. CoE Dean sends letters of congratulation.

In the case of a negative College recommendation for a research investigator or assistant research scientist, the department appoints the candidate to an appropriate staff position or sends a letter of non-reappointment that allows the candidate a terminal year of appointment per the SPG guidelines (201.88) found at: <http://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.88>.

In the case of a negative decision for an associate research scientist, the department sends a letter that outlines plans for improvement and re-review.

B. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

Please ensure that your department's promotion and/or tenure candidate(s) and casebook committee(s) are informed about these guidelines and instructions. Casebook chairs should be given deadlines to meet your department's internal review requirements, and candidates should be advised about working with their committees. The P/T Guidelines may be downloaded from the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA) website: <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/prs-promotions>. SmartPath CV and casebook submission processes are included in Section G: Guidelines for Electronic Submission.

The Department Chairs are responsible for the quality of the casebooks. Casebooks that do not meet the standards as specified in the *Research Faculty Promotion Guidelines of the College of Engineering*, under Section H, "Detailed instructions for preparation of casebooks", may be returned to the Casebook Committee for revisions. **Casebooks that fall well below the standards and require substantial revisions that cannot be easily accommodated may jeopardize the candidate's case.** Any casebook exceeding 20 pages (not including departmental letters, internal and external letters of evaluation, and the candidate's CV) will be returned. Casebooks for all candidates completing the departmental review, whether or not recommended for promotion, must be submitted for Executive Committee (EC) review. If a candidate chooses not to complete the promotion review process, the decision to rescind the casebook must be made before the chair submits the casebook to the EC. Prior to this action, the candidate must make an appointment with the ADAA to discuss his/her case.

Additional appointments (dry or funded) within the College require the approval of the other department. Joint appointments outside of the College require a formal joint review process. Because of the variety of additional and joint appointments in the College, this process may be customized to meet the needs of each individual appointment. Please contact the ADAA with questions about any appointments of this type.

We have included a timetable in the guidelines to summarize the most important steps and dates in this process. Please make sure that you follow this timetable. An electronic copy of each casebook must be submitted via SmartPath by **12 noon on Monday, November 12, 2018**. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the ADAA.

By the end of October, the casebook committee chair prepares for the candidate a separate one-page evaluation that presents the committee's distillation of the casebook. Written comments to the candidate should include the salient aspects of the case, positive and negative, and an invitation for formal response from the candidate to the comments. This assessment memorandum is included in the casebook (H.B.5), and submitted to the candidate simultaneously with submission of the casebook to the Department Chair. The candidate may respond, in writing, to the ADAA with a copy to the Department Chair by November 12, 2018.

At the same time that casebooks are submitted to the College on November 12, 2018, Department Chairs should inform candidates of the department's decision to recommend or not recommend promotion. Please copy the ADAA if this notification is done by letter or email.

The EC will evaluate the casebooks in depth during December 2018 and January 2019. The EC often raises questions about the casebooks and will request the Department Chairs to respond to these questions with additional information or clarification in writing. Department Chairs may consult the candidates to get information for the EC, as long as no confidential elements of the evaluation are disclosed.

The promotion/tenure review meeting with the EC, Department Chairs and Associate Deans is scheduled for **Thursday, January 24 and Friday, January 25**. Please mark your calendars. A review agenda and additional details will be provided mid-January.

C. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE FACULTY CANDIDATE

You will be considered for promotion during the coming academic year. Your department chair will provide you with a list of the promotion committee members who are responsible for the preparation and timely submittal of your casebook. A copy of the instructions to your department chair and promotion committee are available within these guidelines. Your cooperation and assistance is critical for the preparation of a high-quality casebook.

The research scientist track *Promotion Guidelines of the College of Engineering* may be downloaded at <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/prs-promotions/>. Your main responsibility is to prepare the *casebook CV*. This is accomplished through the SmartPath CV module (<https://engin-umich.mntnpass.com/cv>), which you may access directly and/or get assistance from a proxy. Your committee will also have access to your SmartPath CV. Please coordinate your timetable for casebook preparation with that of the committee. An important early task is to provide to the Chair of your committee the following items:

- a) A list of up to 5 names of potential outside evaluators. If there are potential evaluators who you are concerned may not provide a fair or impartial letter of recommendation due to a personal conflict, please provide this information to the promotion committee chair and the department chair, along with a brief explanation.
- b) A list of 2 to 4 names of potential internal faculty evaluators.
- c) A representative set of 4 or 5 of the most important manuscripts or other professionally creative products.

A timetable is included in the guidelines to summarize the most important steps and dates in this process. The completed casebooks, with a written cover letter by the Department Chair, are due to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA) by noon on *Monday, November, 2018*. Depending on the promotion process followed by each department, the departmental executive or advisory committee may participate in the review and evaluation of the casebook. If you choose not to complete the promotion review process, the decision to rescind your casebook must be made BEFORE the chair submits the casebook to the Executive Committee (EC). Prior to such action, you must make an appointment with the ADAA to discuss your case.

- The committee will need most of the Fall term to gather information and prepare the casebook.
- By the end of October, the casebook committee chair prepares for you a separate one-page evaluation that presents the committee's distillation of your casebook. Written comments to you will include the salient aspects of the case, positive and negative, and an invitation for formal input from you on the comments. This assessment memorandum is submitted to you simultaneously with submission of the casebook to the Department Chair. Response is optional, and must be submitted in writing to the ADAA with a copy to your Department Chair by November 12, 2018.
- Your department chair will inform you of your department's decision to recommend or not recommend promotion on November 12, 2018. Any appeals of these recommendations must wait until receipt of the final decision as rendered by the Provost/UMOR.
- The College Executive Committee will evaluate the casebooks in depth during December 2018 and January 2019. The EC sometimes raises questions about the casebooks and will request the Department Chairs to respond with additional information or clarification in writing. Department Chairs may seek your help in responding to EC queries.

- Each case is then discussed at a meeting of the Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, and the EC of the College. An advisory vote is taken on each case by the Associate Deans and Chairs for use by the EC in its subsequent deliberations. All positive promotion cases will be forwarded to the Office of the Vice President for Research by the middle of February where they will undergo further evaluation by the President, Provost, and a casebook review team made up of senior faculty members. A final decision is expected in May 2018.
- The EC's final decisions will be conveyed to your department chair in early March. Your Department Chair will inform you of the EC's decision. The ADAA Office will send you a letter informing you of one of the following decisions:
 - The EC's decision to recommend promotion; or
 - The EC's decision not to recommend promotion.

If you have any questions regarding this process, please do not hesitate to contact the ADAA office. If you have any questions regarding the membership of your promotion committee, please discuss with your Department Chair.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance in this important process.

D. INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROMOTION COMMITTEES

The quality of an educational institution is reflected and determined by the quality of its faculty. Careful review of the performance of our faculty and their qualifications for promotion and/or tenure is therefore among the most important functions to ensure continued excellence and vitality of the College of Engineering. In this process you play an extremely important role. You will prepare all of the evaluative documentation and provide the primary recommendation on which your department will base its recommendation to the College of Engineering, and on which the College's Executive Committee (EC) will base its decisions and recommendations to the Provost and the Vice President for Research. The EC needs and expects:

- a) **an accurate, complete, and compliant casebook,**
- b) **including concise and forthright evaluation**

Casebook guidelines and applicable template documents are available on the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA) website: <https://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/prs-promotions/>. Please note that casebooks are now created using SmartPath. Additional details on document uploads follow within the guidelines.

Please keep in mind and adhere to the following important points:

1. You are an evaluative committee, **not** an advocacy committee. Please report the positive, as well as the negative, so that your department and the EC can base their decisions on facts and objective evaluations of the candidate's contributions. While the casebook is evaluative, the resulting letter of recommendation from the committee is expected to advocate a conclusion based on these facts. This letter is your opportunity to express your concluding judgment on the case.
2. The casebook committee and department chair are jointly responsible for the quality of the casebooks. Casebooks that do not meet the standards as specified in the *Promotion Guidelines* under Section H, "*Detailed instructions for preparation of casebooks,*" may be returned for revisions. Any casebook exceeding 20 pages (not including departmental letters, internal and external letters of evaluation, and the candidate's CV) will be returned. **Incompleteness, inaccuracy, lack of clarity or other casebook flaws may jeopardize the candidate's case.**
3. If you choose to initiate an early contact email message to potential external reviewers to gauge their availability and willingness to serve in this capacity, **your email message must be identical to the one shown in Section E: Sample Solicitation Letters.** (This email will be generated through SmartPath.) All reviewers contacted and their responses are to be included in the casebook.
4. External letters are also intended to provide evaluations and not advocacy statements from the candidate's colleagues at other institutions. To ensure consistency, the University requires a standard solicitation letter, which will be automatically generated through SmartPath. An example of these solicitation letters are shown in **Section E: Sample Solicitation Letters in the Guidelines. The paragraph on confidentiality is a University requirement as well.**
5. Please choose at least eight (8) outside evaluators with the goal of 6-8 letters in the final version of the casebook. Since the absolute minimum number required by the Provost/UMOR is five (5) external letters from referees who have not closely collaborated ("arm's length" or "at a distance"),¹ it is advisable to be safe and end up with additional letters. In choosing the outside

¹ Guidance on what constitutes an "arm's length" reference can be found at http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/procedures.html

evaluators a good rule of thumb is to choose half of the evaluators from a list compiled by the candidate and the other half from your own list of leaders in the field and provide these lists in the casebook. The final casebook must contain a minimum of two arm's length letters from the committee's list. While persons who have served as a candidate's dissertation/thesis adviser or major collaborator can be presumed informed sources, it is also true that their own reputations are involved in the work being evaluated, and as such their evaluations may be discounted. If such letters are included, they are not "at a distance" and they must be in addition to the minimum requirement of five. The casebook must indicate, for each evaluator, whether they were recommended by the candidate or by the Casebook Committee. If outside evaluators do not respond to your request for a written evaluation of the candidate, please explain the reasons.

6. The EC expects the outside evaluators/references to be **at or above the rank (including tenure, if applicable)** for which the candidate is being considered and be from institutions that we consider our peers. Evaluators from non-academic institutions (e.g., government or industry) should hold a stature in the field at least commensurate with the rank considered.
7. Along with your letter to the outside evaluators SmartPath will provide a link to:
 - a current curriculum vitae (CV) of the candidate (from the SmartPath CV module); and
 - a representative set of four (4) or five (5) of the most important manuscripts and/or other professionally creative products of the candidate, as chosen by the candidate.
 - UMOR's guidelines on criteria for faculty ranks
8. All external evaluation letters must be included in the casebook. To put the outside references into perspective for the EC and the UMOR, include a brief, 3–5 sentence statement of background information for each outside evaluator. The bios should include:
 - name and title(s)
 - affiliation
 - brief description of credentials in the field of expertise, including well understood measures of stature such as: fellows of societies; national academy membership; prestigious awards; editorships; and society offices
 - his/her relationship to the candidate (e.g., none, follows research, classmate, personal friend, graduate instructor, dissertation committee member, co-author, or co-investigator).
9. The candidate may submit a "stop list". Letters should not be solicited from people whose name appears on this list.
10. The committee or department may receive unsolicited letters regarding the candidate. All such letters, whether negative or positive, shall be addressed and analyzed by the committee and included in the casebook.
11. Members of the committee should read the most important publications of the candidate, talk to students and colleagues, and arrive at a substantive evaluation to be conveyed to the EC.
12. To help in critically evaluating the evidence of professional creativity and collegiality demonstrated by the candidate, you should obtain input from at least two internal faculty members, at or above the rank under consideration, to whom you should provide the same material sent to outside evaluators.

We have included a timetable in the guidelines to summarize the most important steps and dates in this process. Please make sure that you follow this timetable. Your department will provide further detail regarding their review, to ensure their ability to submit the final version with recommendations by **12 noon on Monday, November 12, 2018.**

1. By the end of October, the casebook committee chair prepares for the candidate a separate 1-page evaluation that presents the committee's distillation of the casebook. Written comments to the candidate should include the salient aspects of the case, positive and negative, and an invitation for

formal response from the candidate. The memorandum should not be a recommendation from the committee or advice for improvement, but a distillation of the facts. It should not characterize or refer to external or internal letters in any way. Please see the sample letter in **Section F: Example Memorandum from Casebook Committee to Candidate** of the *Guidelines*. (Please do not use this example as a template, but as an example of the level and tone of such letters.) This assessment memorandum is submitted to the candidate simultaneously with submission of the casebook to the Department Chair. The assessment memorandum to the candidate is also included in the casebook (H.B.5). The candidate may respond, in writing, to the ADAA with a copy to the Department Chair by November 12, 2018.

2. At the same time casebooks are submitted to the College (on November 12, 2018), Department Chairs will inform candidates by letter or email of the department's recommendation.
3. The EC will evaluate the casebooks in depth during December 2018 and January 2019. The EC often raises questions about the casebooks and will request the Department Chairs to respond to these questions with additional information or clarification in writing. Department Chairs will use discretion in sharing some of the points with the candidates to get their feedback when preparing feedback for the EC.

Finally, we want to bring the issue of confidentiality to your attention. Casebooks contain personal information and should be handled with extreme care. Please treat all the information you receive, and the final casebook, as confidential. If you have any questions on the format or any of the above, please do not hesitate to contact the ADAA Office.

Please note that the committee's completed casebooks should be submitted to the candidate's Department Chair with enough time allowed for departmental review and forwarded to the ADAA Office by **Monday, November 12, 2018.**

E. SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS

Pre-email to potential external reviewers (Optional – must be verbatim)

Dear [Professor, Dr., etc.]:

[Optional one sentence of personal greeting.]

We are considering [candidate and current title of candidate] for promotion to [title]. Dr. [_____]’s area of expertise is in [enter discipline here]. Your name has been suggested as a potential reviewer with respect to this case.

Out of courtesy to our reviewers, we invite you to respond to this email message by indicating which of the categories below best characterizes your circumstances:

- A. Yes, I am available to serve as an external reviewer;
- B. No, I am unavailable due to time constraints;
- C. No, I am not able to serve in this capacity because the candidate’s area is too distant from my own expertise to provide an objective and thorough evaluation.

Please respond by restricting your answer to one of the three options. We would appreciate your response by [deadline here].

Research Scientist Track Solicitation Letter for External Recommendations

(All internal and external template letters will be generated through SmartPath. The following is provided for information only.)

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 scientist track. Faculty at the University of Michigan on the research scientist 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] 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] 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] 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] work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?
6. Might [his/her] 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 fail to respond, this will be so noted in the promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Title]

Enclosures

Internal Faculty Solicitation

Dear Professor [name]:

I am contacting you as chair of the promotion casebook committee of [TITLE] [NAME], who is being considered for promotion to the rank of [RANK]. We are seeking assessments of [his/her] research, teaching, service and other scholarly contributions from colleagues within the University. We particularly invite you to address the effectiveness and value of this faculty member as a member of the College of Engineering community and as a colleague. To aid your assessment, I am attaching [his/her] CV and copies of some of [his/her] papers. To be included in our committee's deliberations, we would need your comments by [deadline]. I thank you in advance for your time and effort.

F. EXAMPLE MEMORANDUM FROM CASEBOOK COMMITTEE TO CANDIDATE (1 PAGE MAXIMUM)

Please do not use this example as a template, but as a guide for the level and tone of the message.

EXAMPLE

To: Dr. X
From: Casebook Chair
Date: November XX, XXXX
Subject: Assessment of promotion casebook

This memo summarizes the casebook committee's understanding of the key aspects of your professional record to date, with an emphasis on the time during which you have held the rank of [Assistant, Associate] Professor [with, without] tenure. This information forms the basis for the committee's evaluation of your contributions to teaching, research, and service. Please review this information carefully. You may respond in writing to this memo, to correct misunderstandings or to add missing information. If you choose to do so your response should be delivered to [Department Chair] and ADAA Michael Wellman by [refer to guideline timeline for date].

Teaching *{sample paragraphs/sentences representing a variety of teaching performances}*

Your record in classroom teaching has been excellent. Your teaching evaluations and comments from students are outstanding and we congratulate you on receiving the XXX Award for teaching. You have also demonstrated willingness to advise undergraduate projects and work with distance education.

Your teaching evaluations, particularly at the undergraduate level, are notably below the College averages. We note that you have shown some improvement in the past year through work with CRLT-Engin.

Research *{sample paragraphs/sentences representing a variety of research performances}*

Your scholarly output has been excellent. We note that most of your published papers are with your Ph.D. or post-doc advisors, but that your recently submitted papers are with your students. You have been successful at attracting funding for your research, including the competitive NSF Career Award. Your research has been recognized by several best paper awards.

Your scholarly productivity with students has been outstanding, your collaborations with colleagues are healthy, and you have demonstrated an ability to attract research funding. Earning an NSF Career Award, and your XXX, YYY, and ZZZ awards indicate excellent ability to support your students' research.

Your scholarly output has been below the expectations for faculty at the College of Engineering. You have attracted research funding and Ph.D. students, but have published only xx research papers. At this point we note several publications in review or preparation and significant proposals pending, indicative of an upward trajectory.

Service *{sample paragraphs/sentences representing a variety of service performances}*

Your service contributions are somewhat less than might be expected even for a junior faculty member. We do not encourage an over-emphasis on service at this point in your career, but a little greater contribution to your Department, College, or profession would be appropriate.

Your service has been appropriate for a junior faculty member. You have made noteworthy contributions to diversity through XXX and the YYY programs.

G. GUIDELINES FOR ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION AND CASEBOOK DOCUMENT FORMAT

Objectives

Our objectives are to develop promotion/tenure casebook procedures for the complete electronic submission of casebooks, and to establish standard casebook formats.

- **Format for Each Document Upload of the Casebook**

- *General:* Margins: 1" top, bottom, left, right
Font: Times New Roman or Times, size 11

- **Format Content**

The format content for the casebooks is outlined in Section H., "Detailed Instructions for Preparation of Casebooks."

- **Electronic Submission**

Casebooks must be submitted via SmartPath (<https://engin-umich.mntnpass.com>). For access and questions, contact Sherry Hall at sfolsom@umich.edu.

Once the ADAA Office submits casebooks to the Provost/UMOR's Office, departments will be contacted to destroy their copies.

- **The Electronic Casebook**

The final casebook will be generated into a pdf document via SmartPath and copies will be provided to the EC, associate deans and department chairs (limited hard copies of the casebook will be made as necessary).

H. DETAILED INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF CASEBOOKS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	Cover letter prepared by the Dean.....	20
B.	Chair/Department Letters	20
C.	Curriculum Vitae.....	21
D.	Documentation of Teaching	22
	Committee’s Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable)	22
E.	Documentation of Research	23
	Committee’s Evaluation of Research and Impact	23
	Ranking of Journals	23
	Candidate’s own ranking of journals/conferences.....	23
	Committee’s ranking of journals/conferences	23
F.	Documentation of Service	24
	Committee’s Evaluation of Service	24
G.	Brief Description of Credentials of External Reviewers and Relationship to Candidate ..	25
	External reviewers (listed alphabetically by last name) who provided review letters	25
	External Reviewers who did provide review letter	25
H.	Sample Letter Sent to External Reviewers.....	26
I.	Evaluation Letters by all External Reviewers.....	27
J.	Evaluation Letters by all Internal Reviewers.....	28
	Appendix – Records of Communications.....	29

SUMMARY DOCUMENTS

A. Dean's Cover Letter

- The ADAA office will prepare this section.

B. Chair/Department Letters

Direct quotes from external reviewers, if used in any of these letters, must be referred to as Reviewer A, B, C, etc. Do not include names of external reviewers. Names of internal reviewers (faculty or students) should also be avoided. Labels should match the reviewer bio list.

1. Letter prepared by Department Chair.
Upload a signed letter to SmartPath describing the key facts of the case and justifying the department recommendation. The narrative must include a 2–3 sentence assessment of the **impact** of the candidate's research or scholarly work. It should also document the department decision-making process (i.e., vote by faculty at rank or higher, or department executive committee), the actual vote tally (ex, 7-0-0, 7-1), and the chair's own recommendation. Explain any votes against promotion.
2. Letter from the Review Committee to the Department Chair presenting their conclusions and recommendation.
The letter must include the actual vote tally (ex, 3-0, 2-1) of the committee's recommendation. Explain votes against promotion. According to the UMOR/Provost guidelines, "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."
3. Letter prepared by joint/additional Department Chair.
Required if candidate has an appointment in another school or department. If the joint/additional department Executive or Advisory Committee votes on promotion casebooks, the actual vote tally should be included in the letter.
4. Optional letters from Review Committee members, if they disagree with the Committee's recommendation or wish to modify the letter. Absence of these letters will imply agreement with the Committee's letter. Upload the signed letter to SmartPath
5. Memorandum from the Review Committee to the candidate. (1 page maximum)
A copy of the memorandum sent by the committee to the candidate on submission of the casebook to the Department.

C. Curriculum Vitae

- SmartPath CV. Go to: <https://engin-umich.mntnpass.com/cv>. All candidates have access to their CV. Candidate's may also allow a proxy to access their CV for editing.
- The completed CV will be uploaded to the promotion module.
- If a SmartPath CV isn't available, the candidate may provide a CV in the required format from the ADAA website at: <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/prs-promotions/>.

D. Documentation of Teaching

If direct quotes from external reviewers are used in this section, they should be labeled as Reviewer A, B, C, etc. Do not include the reviewer's name. Please also avoid using internal faculty and student names when quoting.

Please note: If the candidate has not been involved in teaching, please mark this section as N/A.

The template for this is located on the ADAA website at: <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/prs-promotions/>

Committee's Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable)

(Two page maximum)

Overall assessment of candidate's teaching contributions including: classroom instruction; supervision of graduate student instructors in undergraduate courses; conduct and supervision of laboratory instruction; mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in research; advising students in the major; supervision of field work; and supervision of clinical and practicum experiences. **REMINDER:** For faculty members with interdisciplinary appointments, please comment on contributions to interdisciplinary activities with regards to teaching.

E. Documentation of Research

If direct quotes from external reviewers are used in this section, they should be labeled as Reviewer A, B, C, etc. Do not include the reviewer's name. Please also avoid using internal faculty and student names when quoting.

Committee's Evaluation of Research and Impact

(Two page maximum)

The template for this is located on the ADAA website at: <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/prs-promotions/>

- This section should summarize and assess the key scholarly contributions of the candidate, synthesizing input from a variety of sources such as the internal and external letters, and the candidate's publications. Specific examples should be given, ideally with reference to the important papers. Evidence for impact of the work should be highlighted. (If bibliometrics such as h-index are provided, please indicate the source.)
- Whereas a few key quotes could be helpful, this is not a section in which to reproduce generic accolades from the external letters.
- The narrative should specifically address the specified criteria (see Appendix I) for promotion to the rank under consideration. In particular, the evaluation should assess impact and reputation based on specific research contributions.
- Specific contributions to technology transfer and entrepreneurship should be included in this section, if applicable.

Ranking of Journals

The template for this is located on the ADAA website at: <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/prs-promotions/>

Candidate's own ranking of journals/conferences

- Include candidate's information here.
- Candidate may include a brief rationale for the selection of publication venues

Committee's ranking of journals/conferences

- Committee's qualitative ranking of the journals, conferences, and proceedings in the candidate's list of publications, and implications of impact factors of journals if any.
- Comment on conventions of order of authors in the candidate's discipline (e.g., lead author last).

F. Documentation of Service

If direct quotes from external reviewers are used in this section, they should be labeled as Reviewer A, B, C, etc. Do not include the reviewer's name. Please also avoid using internal faculty and student names when quoting.

The template for this is located on the ADAA website at: <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/prs-promotions/>

Committee's Evaluation of Service

(One page maximum)

Overall assessment of candidate's contributions to service including diversity and climate activities.

G. Brief Description of Credentials of External Reviewers and Relationship to Candidate

External reviewers (listed alphabetically by last name) who provided review letters

SmartPath will generate the list of bios for each reviewer with the information provided in the system by the department. Below is information needed. See section I for the definition of arm's length.

Through SmartPath, designate each reviewer as either "arm's length" or "non arm's length" and whether the reviewer was suggested by the candidate or by the department.

- name and title(s)
- institution or corporation
- brief description of his or her credentials, including well understood measures of stature such as: fellows of societies, members of the NAE/NAS; editorships; endowed chairs; and leadership in professional society offices
- his or her relationship to the candidate; e.g. classmate, personal friend, graduate instructor, dissertation committee member, co-author, or co-investigator. Dissertation/thesis advisors, major collaborators, if included, are not considered part of the minimum count for external letters

REMINDER: For a non-academic external reviewer is identified as being "arm's length", provide justification that the title held by the reviewer equates to or is at a level above the academic rank to which the candidate is being considered for promotion.

External Reviewers who did not provide review letters

SmartPath will generate a list of reviewers solicited who did not provide a letter, along with the reason, based on information provided by the department.

H. Sample Letter Sent to External Reviewers

The required solicitation letter will be generated in SmartPath. For reference, a copy of the template letter is provided in section E in the guidelines above.

I. Evaluation Letters by all External Reviewers

A minimum of five external arm's length letters are required, two must be from the committee's list. The letters received are uploaded by the reviewer or department user. SmartPath will list them alphabetically.

Definition of arm's length

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. We do not consider letters from persons who have served on a candidate's thesis or dissertation committee to be "arm's length."

Provost Office information on promotions:

http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/procedures.html

While persons who have served as the candidate's dissertation or thesis adviser or major collaborator can be presumed informed sources, it is also true that their own reputations are involved in the work being evaluated, and as such their evaluations may be discounted. If such letters are included, they must be in addition to the minimum requirement of five.

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, provide a statement with the bio noting the absence of a direct collaboration.

We expect that all letters will be received via SmartPath either by the reviewer or by the designated department user. If the letter is received outside of the SmartPath system, external letters may be accepted in the following manner:

- Original signed letters
- Evaluation letters sent by email:
 - If the text is in the body of the email (needs to be a university or business email address, the Provost Office and UROM will not accept personal email addresses); or
 - If the email attachment is accompanied by the original email within which it came (needs to be a university or business email address, the Provost Office and UROM will not accept personal email addresses); or
 - 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
- Evaluation letters sent by fax with the appearance of an original signature (obvious electronic signatures will be returned)
- If a letter is received without a signature and is not delivered electronically, a letter or email message addressed to the ADAA or Executive Committee from the casebook committee chair verifying the authenticity of the letter must be included in the casebook.

Note: If an external letter is received outside the system, it must be uploaded to SmartPath by the designated department user.

J. Evaluation Letters by all Internal Reviewers

SmartPath will generate a list of all internal reviewers solicited.

- Faculty (include a minimum of 2 letters from faculty at or above the rank proposed).
- If the candidate is involved in teaching, letters may be solicited from students, but are not required for research scientist track promotion. If solicited, the department will provide the information noted in the table below within SmartPath. The information may be added to the bio section in SmartPath for each student.

Student Name	UG/Grad	Year or expected Grad Year and Dept	Relationship*	Suggested by committee or candidate:
--------------	---------	-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------------------------------

**Advisor, course instructor, research mentor, etc.*

- Other personnel
- All letters received must be included in the casebook

Appendix – Records of Communications

Sample emails will be generated here via SmartPath. RS-1 and RS-2 forms will be uploaded to SmartPath by the department user.

- a. Include a copy of the email sent to all external reviewers.
- b. Include a copy of the email sent to all internal reviewers.
- c. Upload signed RS-1 form.
- d. Upload signed RS-2 form.

I. UMOR GUIDELINES ON CRITERIA FOR FACULTY RANK

Research faculty rank criteria for appointment and promotion to the research scientist track. SmartPath will provide the criteria in the link of materials to reviewers.

Associate Research Scientist

Key Characteristic	Requirements
Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strong local and growing national scholarly reputation on the basis of research productivity and contributions over several years, possibly as part of a larger research program.• Record of peer-reviewed publications.• Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.
Independence	Independence not required, but may be developing.
Teaching	No requirement for teaching.
Service	No requirement for institutional service.

Research Scientist

Key Characteristic	Requirements
Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strong national and international scholarly reputation on the basis of sustained research productivity and contributions.• Substantial record of peer-reviewed publications.• Significant, sustained participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.
Independence	A record of independent scholarship and funding.
Teaching	No requirement for teaching.
Service	No requirement for institutional service.