

Table of Contents

Research Faculty Guidelines
College of Engineering 2016-2017

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

A..Timetable of Promotion process -----	2
B..Memorandum Sent to the Department Chair- -----	5
C..Memorandum Sent to the Candidate- -----	7
D..Instructions for Promotion Committees- -----	9
E. .Email to Potential External Reviewers -----	12
F. Sample Letter for External Recommendations-----	13
G. Template Email to Potential Internal Reviewers-----	17
H. Example Memorandum from Casebook Committee to Candidate -----	16
I. Guidelines for Electronic Submission-----	17
J. Detailed Instructions for Preparation of Casebooks-----	18
K..UMOR Policies on Promotion of Research Faculty -----	29

Website resources

UMOR promotion guidelines:

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

2016

April - June

Casebook committee membership: Formation of committees by Departments and approval of casebook committees by CoE Executive Committee

Friday, April 8

ADAA requests sent to Department Chairs for casebook committees

Friday, April 29

Department casebook committee recommendations due to ADAA

ADAA sends EC approval of or changes for casebook committees to Department Chairs

June 6

Meeting of P/T Candidates
Johnson Rooms (3rd Floor LEC)

June 9

Meeting of Casebook Committee Chairs and presentation of The Fence Pierpont – East Room

Mid-late June
(projected)

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

Casebook Preparers' workshop for staff

October-November

In addition to the summary evaluation for the casebook, the casebook committee chair prepares for the candidate a 1-page summary evaluation, that presents the committee's distillation of the casebook. Written comments to the candidate will include the salient aspects of the case, positive and negative, and a request for formal input from the candidate on the comments. 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 (J.B.5). Department deadlines for submission of casebook to the Department Chair will differ but this evaluation can be expected by the end of October.

The candidate may respond, in writing, to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs with a copy to the Department Chair by November 14, 2016.

**Monday, November 14
12 noon**

Submission of electronic and original casebook to the ADAA.
(Due to time constraints, casebooks submitted past this deadline will NOT be considered in the promotion/tenure review.)

Candidate's letter of response to casebook committee letter to ADAA with a copy to the Department Chair.

Monday, November 14 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.

2017

January

Executive Committee (EC) discussion of casebooks. The EC will evaluate the casebooks in depth during December 2016 and January 2017. 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 19
(projected) All day meeting to discuss promotion/tenure casebooks for tenured and tenure track faculty casebooks and Research Professor/Scientist promotion casebooks
GM Conference Room

Friday, January 20
(projected) Discuss remaining tenured and tenure track faculty casebooks and research professor/Scientist promotion casebooks
GM Conference Room (if needed)

Wednesday, Feb. 8
(projected) Submission of Executive Committee recommendations for promotion and all candidate casebooks to the Provost/UMOR.

Timetable for Academic Year 2016-17

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/pdf/201.88.pdf>.

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: *Memorandum Sent to the Department Chair*

MEMORANDUM

TO: College of Engineering Department Chairs

FROM: Michael P. Wellman
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

DATE: July 5, 2016

SUBJECT: Promotion Guidelines

Please distribute the enclosed materials related to the preparation of promotion packages to: a) department faculty member(s) scheduled to be reviewed during the 2016-17 academic year; b) the reviewing committee chair; and c) reviewing committee members. The Research Faculty Guidelines may be downloaded from the ADAA website: <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/prs-promotions/>. Please note the new template for the casebook and CV.

The Department Chairs are responsible for the quality of the casebooks. Casebooks that do not meet the standards as specified in the *Research Faculty Guidelines of the College of Engineering*, under section J, “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 department letters, external letters of evaluation, or candidate’s cv) will be returned. Casebooks for all candidates completing department review, whether or not recommended for promotion, must be submitted for Executive Committee 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 me to discuss his/her case. See the attached addendum from the University of Michigan Office of Research for the policy on extensions for mandatory reviews. You must contact me prior to extending any appointments.

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 me immediately to discuss 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 14, 2016**. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (64)7-7020.

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 will include the salient aspects of the case, positive and negative, and a request for formal input from the candidate on the comments. 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 (J.B.5). The candidate may respond, in writing, to me with a copy to the Department Chair by November 14, 2016.

Please note that your letter summarizing the case for or against promotion must include the following information: Total years in rank for the current appointment and the years in rank at Michigan; whether any of the candidate's years of service have to be excluded for childbirth, dependent care, medical or other reasons (please do not provide detail of reasons behind medical leaves); an evaluative perspective on the case including strengths and weakness (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); a description of the promotion review at each stage of evaluation in the department, summarizing the evaluative comments and the vote tally at each stage); the reasons for recommending or not recommending this candidate; any special circumstances concerning this individual.

At the same time that casebooks are submitted to the College on November 14, 2016, Department Chairs should inform candidates of department decision to recommend or not recommend promotion. Please copy me if this is done by letter or email.

The EC will evaluate the casebooks in depth during December 2016 and January 2017. 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 use their discretion in sharing some of the points with the candidates to get their feedback when preparing feedback for the EC. For example, if the EC had a concern over comments in an external letter, that information should *not* be shared. If the EC was concerned that the candidate rarely attended conferences, the candidate could provide additional information to the Department Chair on that point.

The promotion/tenure review meeting with the EC, Department Chairs and Associate Deans is tentatively scheduled for Thursday, January 19 and Friday, January 20. Please mark your calendars. A review agenda and additional details will be provided by mid-January.

Attached electronically are:

- A list of promotion candidates in your department and their casebook committee chairs and members;
- A list of individual casebook committees for each candidate with casebook committee chairs and members; and
- Letters to casebook committee chairs and candidates

Please distribute as follows:

To Candidates:

Memorandum to candidate
A copy of the memorandum to the committee
The list of the candidate's casebook committee members

To Committee Chairs:

Letter to committee
A copy of the memorandum to the candidate
The list of the candidate's casebook committee members

To Committee Members:

A copy of the memorandum to the committee
A copy of the memorandum to the candidate

MPW:slh

C: *Memorandum Sent to the Faculty Candidate*

MEMORANDUM

TO: Promotion Candidates

FROM: Michael P. Wellman
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

DATE: July 5, 2016

SUBJECT: Approximate Timeline, Committee Membership, and Procedure Followed by the College of Engineering in Evaluating Promotion Casebooks

You will be considered for promotion during the coming academic year, and I would like to inform you of the process that will take place because your cooperation and assistance is critical for the preparation of the casebook.

I have attached the following documents for your information and use:

- a) A listing of the promotion committee members who are responsible for the preparation and timely submittal of your casebook; and
- b) A copy of the letter given to the promotion committee chair

The *Research Faculty Guidelines of the College of Engineering* may be downloaded at <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/prs-promotions/>. Please note that we are using a required template for the casebook and that you are responsible for preparing your CV following this template. You should coordinate your schedule with that of the committee. In particular, please provide to the Chair of your promotion committee as soon as possible, the following items:

- a) A list of up to 5 names of potential outside evaluators. If there are potential evaluators who you feel 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 copy of your academic curriculum vitae (CV), suitable for transmission to the outside evaluators. **NOTE: You must use the template provided by the ADAA office at:** <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/prs-promotions/>
- c) Provide a representative set of 4 or 5 of the most important manuscripts and/or other professionally creative products as discussed with your committee chair.

We have included a timetable in the guidelines to summarize the most important steps and dates in this process. The completed casebooks, in electronic format and original hard copy, with a written cover letter by the Department Chair, are due in my office by noon on *Monday, November 14, 2016*. Depending on the promotion process followed by each department, the departmental executive or advisory committee may participate in the review of the casebook and provide its evaluation. 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 this action, you must make an appointment with me to discuss your case.

- The committee will need most of the fall term to gather information and prepare the casebook. Any casebook exceeding 20 pages (not including departmental letters, internal and external letters of evaluation or candidate's CV) will be returned.
- 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 a request 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. You may respond, in writing, to me with a copy to your Department Chair by November 14, 2016.
- Your department chair will inform you of your department's decision to recommend or not recommend promotion on November 14, 2016. If this is done by letter or email, please make sure I am copied. At this step of the process, you are not allowed to appeal the recommendation of the casebook committee and/or the department. Any appeals of the decision are allowed only after the final decision as approved by the Provost.
- The College Executive Committee will evaluate the casebooks in depth during December 2016 and January 2017. The EC often raises questions about the casebooks and will request the Department Chairs to respond to these questions with additional information or explanation 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, where an advisory vote is made on each case by the Associate Deans and Chairs for use by the EC in its subsequent discussions. 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 UMOR and a casebook review team made up of senior faculty members. A final decision is expected in May 2017.
- 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. I will send a letter to you 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 my office. If you have any questions regarding the membership of your promotion committee, please contact your Department Chair.

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

MPW:slh

D: *Instructions for Promotion committees*

MEMORANDUM

TO: Promotion Review Committee Chairs and Members

FROM: Michael P. Wellman
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

DATE: July 5, 2016

SUBJECT: Evaluation of the Candidates
Details on Preparation of the Casebooks
Recommendation Letters

The quality of an educational institution is reflected by the quality of its faculty. In that context, one of the most important functions of our institution is the review of the performance of our faculty and their subsequent promotion. Some of the most important decisions for the continued excellence and vitality of the College of Engineering are those related to faculty appointments and promotions. In this process you have an extremely important role. You will be preparing all of the evaluative documentation and arriving at 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 UMOR. The EC needs and expects:

- a) **a concise and forthright evaluation; and**
- b) **a high-quality casebook.**

Casebook guidelines are available on our web site: <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/prs-promotions/>. Please note that we are using a required casebook template.

I want to bring to your attention items that are very important and helpful to you and the EC:

1. Always keep in mind that you are an evaluative committee and **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. The department chairs are responsible for the quality of the casebooks. Casebooks that do not meet the standards as specified in the *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* under Section J, "*Detailed instructions for preparation of casebooks,*" may be returned for revisions. **Casebooks that fall well below the standards and require substantial revisions that cannot be easily accommodated may jeopardize the candidate's case.** While the casebook is evaluative, the resulting letter(s) of recommendation from the committee are expected to advocate a conclusion based on these facts. This letter is your opportunity to express your feelings on the case. *Please note that any casebook exceeding 20 pages (not including departmental letters, internal and external letters of evaluation, and the candidate's CV) will be returned.*
2. 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: *Email to potential external reviewers.*** All reviewers contacted and their responses are to be included in the casebook.

3. When asking for letters from outside evaluators, please bear in mind that we are asking for evaluations and not advocacy statements from the candidate's colleagues at other institutions. To this end, **your letter must be identical to the one shown in Section F: Sample letter for external recommendations in the Guidelines. The paragraph on confidentiality is a University requirement as well.** Please note that these letters should explicitly state the rank to which the candidate is being considered for promotion.

4. 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”),* it is advisable to be safe and end up with additional letters. In choosing the outside 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 department/committee’s list. While letters from persons who have served as a candidate’s dissertation/thesis adviser or major collaborator can be especially helpful (because they can be presumed to have a good sense of both the person and the work), it is also true that their own reputations are involved in the work being evaluated. If such letters are included, they are not “at a distance” and they must be in addition to the minimum requirement of five. See Section J.G. for the Provost Office additional criteria of arm’s length letters. **Please indicate if the evaluator was 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.

5. The EC expects the outside evaluators/references to be **at or above the rank** for which the candidate is being considered and be from institutions that we consider our peers, including comparable positions in a government laboratory or in industry. If this is not the case, you will need to explain why.

6. Along with your letter to the outside evaluators please send:
 - A current curriculum vitae (CV) of the candidate (must be in ADAA format); 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.

7. **All external evaluation letters must be included in the casebook.** To put the outside references into perspective for the EC and the Provost/UMOR, include a brief, three (3) to five (5) sentence statement of background information for each outside evaluator. Briefly explain if any evaluators failed to provide letters by the deadline. The bios should include:
 - name and title(s)
 - institution/corporation
 - brief description of his/her credentials in the field of expertise, including well understood measures of stature such as: fellows of societies; members of the NAE/NAS; editorships; named/endowed chairs; and society offices
 - his/her relationship to the candidate (e.g. classmate, personal friend, graduate instructor, dissertation committee member, co-author, or co-investigator). See Section J.G. for the Provost Office for additional criteria of arm’s length letter.

* Guidance on what constitutes an “arm’s length” reference can be found at http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/procedures.html

8. The candidate can submit a “stop list.” Letters should not be solicited from people whose name appears on this list.
9. On occasion a committee or department chair 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.
10. 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.
11. 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 senior faculty members, 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. An electronic copy of each casebook must be submitted via SmartPath by **12 noon on Monday, November 14, 2016.**

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 will include the salient aspects of the case, positive and negative, and a request for formal input from the candidate on the comments. The memorandum should not be a recommendation from the committee, but a distillation of the facts. Please see the sample letter in **Section H: *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 (J.B.5). The candidate may respond, in writing, to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs with a copy to the Department Chair by November 14, 2016.
2. At the same time casebooks are submitted to the College on November 14, 2016, Department Chairs will inform candidates by letter or email of the department’s decision to recommend or not recommend promotion, copying me. 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 me to discuss his/her case.
3. The EC will evaluate the casebooks in depth during December 2016 and January 2017. 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 their discretion in sharing some of the points with the candidates to get their feedback when preparing feedback for the EC.

Finally, I 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 call me at (64)7-7020.

Please note that completed casebooks should be turned in to the candidate's Department Chair with enough time allowed for departmental review and forwarded to the Office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs by **Monday, November 14, 2016**.

MPW:slh
Attachment

E: *Email to potential external reviewers*
(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].

F: *Sample letter for external recommendations*
(All internal and external template letters will be generated through SmartPath. The following are provided for information only.)

**New for 2016-17:
Letters required by the
Provost Office**

SOLICITATION LETTER TEMPLATE

At a minimum, the following language is required:

[Date]

[Name]

[Title]

[Department]

[Institution]

[Street Address]

[City, State, Zip]

Any text in **bold** below is for your attention. It does not need to be bold in your letter to the reviewer.

A copy of the criteria in Section K. UMOR Policies on Promotion of Research Faculty _____

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

G. Template Letter to Potential Internal Reviewers

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

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.

- H. *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 [RANK]. 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, and your response should be delivered to [Department Chair] and Alec Gallimore by [refer to deadline provided in timeline]. Your response can be used to correct misunderstandings and to add missing information.

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

Your scholarly output has been excellent. We note that your published papers are with your Ph.D. advisor, but that your recently submitted papers are with your students. We commend you for the NSF Career Award, the best paper awards, and your ability to attract funding for your research. These are all positive indicators of the success of your research program.

Your scholarly productivity with students has been outstanding, your collaborations with colleagues are healthy and your ability to attract research funding is commendable. 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 significantly below the expectations for research 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.

Teaching (if applicable) *{sample paragraphs/sentences from 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. We also commend your 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.

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

Your service contributions are somewhat less than might be expected even for research 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 research faculty member. We particularly wish to congratulate you for your contributions to diversity through XXX and the YYY programs.

I: *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**

- *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 J., "Detailed Instructions for Preparation of Casebooks."

- **Electronic Submission**

Casebooks must be submitted via SmartPath. For access and questions, contact Sherry Hall at sfolsom@umich.edu.

- **Hard Copy Submission**

For those reviewers quoted in the promotion recommendation, please indicate the reviewer by labeling a hard copy of the letters as Reviewer A, Reviewer B, Reviewer C, etc. Please use this copy of the letters to highlight text used for quotes and upload to Ctools and notify Sherry Hall at sfolsom@umich.edu. (*Do not include quotes from internal letters. Do not label review letters not quoted.*)

Once the ADA 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).

FORMAT OF RESEARCH SCIENTIST PROMOTION CASEBOOKS

- Length: Any casebook exceeding 20 pages, not including CV, department letters, internal or external letters of evaluation, will be returned.
- Font: Times New Roman or Times, size 11 (this does not include the MP CV format).

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
D.1	Committee’s Evaluation of Teaching (if applicable).....	22
E.	Documentation of Research	23
E.1.	Committee’s Evaluation of Research and Impact.....	23
E.2	Ranking of Journals	23
E.2.1.	Candidate’s own ranking of journals/conferences.....	23
E.2.2.	Committee’s ranking of journals/conferences.....	23
F.	Documentation of Service	24
F.1.	Committee’s Evaluation of Service	24
G.	Brief Description of Credentials of External Reviewers and Relationship to Candidate ..	25
G.1.	External reviewers (listed alphabetically by last name) who provided review letters	25
G.2	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

A. Cover letter prepared by the Dean

- The ADAA office will prepare this section.

B. Chair/Department Letters

1. Letter prepared by Department Chair.
Document the department decision-making process (i.e., vote by faculty at rank or higher, or department executive committee), the vote tally, and the chair's own recommendation. Insert text into casebook including an electronic signature by the Department Chair. **Include a 2 to 3 sentence assessment on what impact the faculty member's research or scholarly work has had either within his/her own field or more broadly.**
2. Letter from the Review Committee to the Department Chair presenting their conclusions and recommendation. (Insert text into casebook and provide a signed original to the ADAA Office. All members of the committee must sign this letter.)
The letter must include the vote tally of the committee's recommendation. According to the Provost guidelines on promotion and tenure, "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.
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. Insert text into casebook and provide a signed original to the ADAA Office.
5. Memorandum from the Review Committee to the candidate.
(1 page maximum)
Written summary to the candidate including the salient aspects of the case, positive and negative, and a request for formal input from the candidate on the summary. **A recommendation of the Review Committee should not be included. The original, signed assessment memorandum is submitted to the candidate simultaneously with submission of the casebook to the Department Chair.** Please insert text of the memorandum into the casebook and provide a signed copy to the ADAA Office. Please see the sample letter in **Section H: Example Memorandum from Review Committee to Candidate of the Guidelines**. Please do not use this example as a template, but as guidance for the level and tone of the message.

C. Curriculum Vitae

Candidate must use the SmartPath CV. The CV template may be downloaded from the ADAA website at: <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/research-faculty/prs-promotions/>.

D. Documentation of Teaching

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

D.1 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 his or her contributions to interdisciplinary activities with regards to teaching.

E. Documentation of Research

E.1. Committee's Evaluation of Research and Impact (Two page maximum)

E.2 Ranking of Journals

E.2.1. Candidate's own ranking of journals/conferences

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

E.2.2. Committee's ranking of journals/conferences

- Committee's qualitative ranking of the journals 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).
- **If citations and the H-index are used, please verify with the candidate.**

F. Documentation of Service

**F.1. 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

G.1. External reviewers (listed alphabetically by last name) who provided review letters

SmartPath will generate the bios for each reviewer with the information provided by the department. Below is information needed and the definition of arm's length reviewers.

Through SmartPath, designate each reviewer as either "arm's length" or "not arm's length" and indicate whether the reviewer was suggested by the candidate or by the department.

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."

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.

Note: If 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.

- 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

G.2. External Reviewers who did not provide review letters

A listing of external reviewers, alphabetically by last name, who were asked to write a letter but declined to do so and the reason for declining.

H. Sample Letter Sent to External Reviewers

The required solicitation letter will be generated through SmartPath.

I. Evaluation Letters by all External Reviewers

Include letters from evaluators outside the U of M (minimum of five (5) “arm’s length” letters).

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."

While letters from persons who have served as the candidate’s dissertation or thesis adviser or major collaborator can be especially helpful (because they can be presumed to have a good sense of both the person 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.

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

At least two letters of evaluation by internal reviewers at or above the proposed rank of the candidate are required. Please use the template email in Section G of the guidelines. If the candidate is involved in teaching, letters may be solicited from students, but are not required for research scientist track promotion.

- Provide a list of all internal faculty reviewers contacted.
- List all students contacted (if applicable), and note whether the student was suggested by the candidate or the committee.
- 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.
(Insert text of email here.)
- b. Include a copy of the email sent to all internal reviewers.
(Insert text of email here.)
- c. Include the original, signed RS-1 form.
- d. Include the original, signed RS-2 form.

K: College of Engineering and UMOR Guidelines on Criteria for Faculty Rank

See the following page.

Criteria for Research Faculty Appointment and Promotion
College of Engineering

May 13, 2014

Performance area		Assistant Research Scientist	Associate Research Scientist	Research Scientist	Research Associate Professor	Research Professor	
Scholarship	Office of Research Criteria		Potential for scholarly development, possibly as part of a larger research program. Record of peer-reviewed publications. Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.	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.	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.	Strong local and national reputation on the basis of research productivity and contributions over several years consistent with that of a tenured associate professor. Substantial record of peer-reviewed publications. Significant, sustained participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.	Exemplary and sustained national and international reputation and achievements equivalent to a tenured professor.
	CoE Criteria	Performance	Potential, possibly as part of a large program	Productive over several years, possibly as part of a large program	Sustained productivity and contributions	Productivity & contributions similar to TT	Exemplary and sustained, similar to TT
		Peer-reviewed pubs	Some, as a result of Ph.D. or post doc training	Growing record	Substantial record	Substantial record of productivity	Exemplary record of productivity
		Professional community	Participation	Participation	Significant & sustained participation	Significant & sustained participation	Exemplary & sustained participation
		Reputation	Potential	Strong local + growing national	Strong national + international	Strong local + national	Strong national + international
	Impact	None	Some	Significant	Significant	Significant	
Independence	Office of Research Criteria		Independence not required, but may be developing.	Independence not required, but may be developing.	A record of independent scholarship and funding.	Independent scholarship and funding.	Independent scholarship and independent sustained funding.
	CoE Criteria	Intellectual	None, but may be developing	Developing	Strong evidence.	Strong evidence	Evidence of sustained independence
Funding		None	Evidence of proposal efforts as PI or co-PI	Evidence of success with funding as PI or co-PI	Evidence of successful funding as PI.	Evidence of sustained funding as PI	
Teaching	Office of Research Criteria		No formal requirement for teaching.	No formal requirement for teaching.	No formal requirement for teaching.	A record of substantial non-didactic teaching and mentoring of postdoctoral fellows, junior research colleagues, or students at any level within the context of one or more research fields.	A record of substantial non-didactic teaching and mentoring of postdoctoral fellows, junior research colleagues, or students at any level within the context of one or more research fields.
	CoE Criteria	non-didactic	Not required	Not required	Participation in student mentoring	Substantial record	Substantial record
		didactic	None	None	None	Not required	Not required
Service	Internal	No formal requirement	No formal requirement	No formal requirement	Significant (less than TT)	Substantial (less than TT)	
	External	None	Some	Expected	Expected	Expected	
Time in Rank policy		Per CoE, 7 years, including a terminal year if not promoted	None	N/A	None	N/A	

1. CoE does not use the rank of research assistant professor.
2. OVPR has a 4 year time in rank limit for research investigator.
3. The criteria outlined here will be applied to promotion and appointment effective 2015-2016.