

## Table of Contents

### **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines College of Engineering 2025-2026**

(<http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/admin/ptr/>)

A. Timetable of Promotion and/or Tenure process -----	1
B. Instructions for the Department Chair-----	4
C. Instructions for the Candidate -----	6
D. Instructions for P/T Committees -----	8
E. Sample Solicitation Letters -----	11
F. Example Memorandum from Casebook Committee to Candidate -----	21
G. Guidelines for Electronic Submission-----	23
H. Detailed Instructions for Preparation of Casebooks-----	24
I. Statement of Criteria for Promotion and Tenure-----	38
J. Board of Regents: Qualifications for Appointment and Promotion -----	46
K. Website resources	
Office of the Provost-Faculty promotion guidelines:	
<a href="http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/">http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/</a>	
Office of the Provost- Faculty tenure guidelines:	
<a href="http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/tenure_review/policies.html">http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/tenure_review/policies.html</a>	
Sample promotion recommendation:	
<a href="http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/AttachmentD.pdf">http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/AttachmentD.pdf</a>	

## A. TIMETABLE FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 2025-2026

### 2025

#### **March – July**

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

**March 18**

ADAA requests sent to Department Chairs for casebook committees

**April 25**

Department casebook committee recommendations due to ADAA

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

**June 13**

Meeting of P/T Committee Chairs  
10:00-11:30am, Hybrid, GM Room

**Mid-May**  
(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**

**July/August**

Casebook Preparers' workshop for staff. Date TBA.

**Mid September**

Presentation of CRLT Player's performance of "Tenure Decisions" for committee chairs/members and others involved in casebook review. Date/Time TBA, in-person, Johnson Rooms.

#### **October-November**

Casebook preparation and evaluation. Department deadlines may differ but typically complete casebooks for departmental review are 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 November 5, 2025.

**Wednesday, November 5** Submission of electronic casebook to ADAA.  
**12 noon**

**Wednesday, November 5** Department Chairs inform candidates of department decision to recommend or not recommend promotion and/or the granting of tenure. If this is done by letter or email, the ADAA should be copied.

## **2026**

### **January**

Executive Committee discussion of casebooks. The College EC will evaluate the casebooks in depth during December 2025 and January 2026. On occasion, the EC raises questions about the casebook and requests the relevant Department Chair to respond with additional information for clarification. The Department Chair, if appropriate, may request feedback from the candidate in order to respond with full information.

#### **Mid-January**

ADAA communication to Department Chairs requesting responses to questions raised by the EC on candidate casebooks

### **January-February**

**Thursday, Jan. 15**  
*(projected)*

All day meeting to discuss promotion/tenure casebooks for tenure-track and research-track faculty  
Room/date TBA

**Friday, Jan. 16**  
*(projected)*

Discuss remaining promotion/tenure casebooks  
Room/date TBA

**Wednesday, Feb. 4**  
*(projected)*

Submission of Executive Committee recommendations for promotion and/or to grant tenure and all candidate casebooks to the Provost. All tenure cases (positive and negative) and all positive promotion cases will be forwarded to the Provost. All positive research casebooks are forwarded to the Provost and/or UMOR.

#### **February**

The EC's final decisions will be conveyed to the departments in mid to late February. The Department Chair will inform the candidate of the decision. Department Chairs will also be notified of promotions for faculty holding additional or joint appointments.

### **February-May**

Provost reviews all casebooks. Recommendations approved by the Provost and President are forwarded to the Regents for approval. Regents normally approve recommendations in May.

### **June**

Provost/UMOR sends letter to each candidate who has received promotion and/or granted tenure. CoE Dean sends letters of congratulation. Faculty listings appear in the *University Record* in May.

In the case of a negative College recommendation on a tenure case, the department sends a letter of non-reappointment that allows the candidate a

terminal year of appointment per SPG policy 201.88,  
<http://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.88>.

In the case of a negative College recommendation for an 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 per SPG 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/admin/ptr/>. SmartPath CV and casebook submission processes are included in Section G: Guidelines for Electronic Submission. Please note the Statement of Criteria for Promotion and Tenure in Section I, which will be sent to all reviewers solicited.

Department Chairs are ultimately responsible for the quality of casebooks. Casebooks that do not meet the standards as specified in the *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines of the College of Engineering*, under Section H, "Detailed instructions for preparation of casebooks", may be returned for revisions.

**Casebooks that fall well below the standards 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/tenure, must be submitted for Executive Committee (EC) review. If a candidate chooses not to complete the review process, the request to rescind the casebook must be made before external letters are requested. After letters are received, only under exceptional circumstances could a casebook be rescinded.

**New from last year:** Casebooks for faculty members holding additional and/or joint academic appointments in more than one school/college/unit must be coordinated with each of the respective schools/colleges/units. This includes dry appointments without effort and joint appointments on different tracks. The respective units should have a preliminary discussion confirming internal processes, timelines, and agreed upon external reviewers for all appointments. In these instances, the instructional tenure track promotion with JOINT ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS (F-2) template solicitation letter should be used. The final solicitation letter should include all appointments held by the candidate. 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. The final casebook must include endorsements from each unit the candidate holds an academic appointment (courtesy or otherwise), stating whether that unit recommends promotion of the candidate. 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.

We have included a timetable in the guidelines to summarize the most important steps and dates in this process. An electronic copy of each casebook must be submitted via SmartPath by **12 noon on Wednesday, November 5, 2025.**

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. **The committee's recommendation should not be revealed in their memorandum.** This assessment memorandum is included in the casebook (H.C.5) and submitted to the candidate simultaneously with submission of the casebook to the Department. The candidate may respond, in writing, to the ADAA with a copy to the Department Chair by November 5, 2025.

At the same time that casebooks are submitted to the College on November 5, 2025, Department Chairs should inform candidates of the department's decision to recommend or not recommend promotion and/or granting of tenure. Please copy the ADAA if this notification is done by letter or email.

The EC will evaluate the casebooks in depth during December 2025 and January 2026. 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 **January 15 and January 16**. Please block your calendars. A review agenda and additional details will be provided in early January.

## C. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE CANDIDATE

You will be considered for promotion and/or tenure during the coming academic year. Your department chair will notify you of the membership of your P/T committee: three faculty members who are responsible for the construction and timely submittal of your casebook. Your cooperation and engagement is essential for the preparation of a high-quality casebook.

The *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines of the College of Engineering* may be downloaded at <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/admin/ptr/>. Your main responsibility is to prepare the *casebook CV and Summary of contributions to and major impact on teaching, research, and service*. 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 and Summary of contributions to and major impact on teaching, research, and service. Please coordinate your timetable for casebook preparation with that of the committee. An important early task is to provide to the Chair of your P/T 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 P/T committee chair and the department chair, along with a brief explanation. **(Do not reach out to any potential external reviewers.)**
- b) A list of 2 to 4 names of potential internal faculty evaluators and 2 to 4 students (both graduate and undergraduate). **(Do not reach out to any potential internal or student reviewer.)**
- c) A representative set of 4 or 5 of your most important manuscripts or other professionally creative products.

Please also take note of the College of Engineering's statement of criteria for promotion and tenure or UMOR's criteria for promotion of research faculty, as applicable (Section I). These criteria will be included with materials sent to evaluators. Specific reference to the criteria in the casebook committee's recommendations and narrative assessments, with corresponding evidence, will enhance the effectiveness of the casebook evaluation.

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 *Wednesday, November 5, 2025*. Your departmental executive or advisory committee (if applicable) may participate in the review and evaluation of the casebook, per departmental procedures. If you wish to consider not completing the review process, you are strongly encouraged to consult the ADAA prior to withdrawing. Any request to rescind the casebook must be made before external letters are requested. After letters are received, only under exceptional circumstances could a casebook be rescinded.

- The committee will need much of the Fall term to gather information and prepare the casebook.
- By the end of October, the casebook committee chair will prepare 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. Response is optional and must be submitted in writing to the ADAA with a copy to your Department Chair by November 5, 2025.

- Your department chair will inform you of your department's decision to recommend or not recommend promotion and/or granting of tenure on November 5, 2025. Any appeals of these recommendations must wait until receipt of the final decision as rendered by the Provost.
- The College Executive Committee will evaluate the casebooks in depth during December 2025 and January 2026. The EC sometimes raises questions about the casebooks and may 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 by the Associate Deans and Chairs for use by the EC in its subsequent deliberations. All tenure cases (positive and negative) and positive tenure-track promotion cases will be forwarded to the Provost's Office in February where they will undergo further evaluation by the President, Provost, and a casebook review team made up of senior faculty members. Positive research-track cases are likewise referred to UMOR for further review. Tenure-track casebooks approved by the President and the Provost will be submitted to the Regents for approval at their May meeting. The official list will be printed in the *University Record*. UMOR decisions are announced in May.
- The EC's final decisions will be conveyed to your department chair by mid to late February.

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 P/T committee, please discuss with your Department Chair.

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



## D. INSTRUCTIONS FOR P/T 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. 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: <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/admin/ptr/>. Casebooks are assembled and routed through an online system called 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 all relevant evidence, whether positive or negative, so that further evaluators can base their decisions on facts and objective assessments of the candidate's contributions. While the casebook is evaluative, the resulting letter of recommendation from the committee is expected to support 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 and Tenure 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, the candidate's CV, and summary of contributions) will be returned. **Incompleteness, inaccuracy, lack of clarity, or other casebook flaws may jeopardize the candidate's case.**
3. Casebooks for faculty members holding additional and/or joint academic appointments in more than one school/college/unit must be coordinated with each of the respective schools/colleges/units. This includes dry appointments without effort and joint appointments on different tracks. The respective units should have a preliminary discussion confirming internal processes, timelines, and agreed upon external reviewers for all appointments. In these instances, the instructional tenure track promotion with JOINT ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS (F-2) template solicitation letter should be used. The final solicitation letter should include all appointments held by the candidate. The final casebook must include endorsements from each unit the candidate holds an academic appointment (courtesy or otherwise), stating whether that unit recommends promotion of the candidate.
4. 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.
5. 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. Examples

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.

6. Please choose at least eight (8) outside evaluators with the goal of receiving 6-8 letters for the casebook. Since the absolute minimum number required by the Provost is five (5) external letters from referees who have not closely collaborated (termed “arm’s length”),\* 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 identification of authorities and leaders in the field. The final casebook must contain a minimum of two arm’s length letters from the committee’s list. Whereas a candidate’s dissertation/thesis adviser or major collaborator can be presumed an informed source, 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 “arm’s length” 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.
7. 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.
8. 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).
  - The candidate’s summary of contributions to and impact on teaching, research, and service.
  - A representative set of four or five of the most important manuscripts or other professionally creative products of the candidate, as chosen by the candidate.
  - The College of Engineering’s Statement of Criteria for Promotion and Tenure *or* UMOR’s Criteria description (see Section I).
9. All external evaluation letters must be included in the casebook. To put the outside references into perspective for the EC and the Provost, 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
  - relationship to the candidate (e.g., none, follows research, classmate, personal friend, graduate instructor, dissertation committee member, co-author, or co-investigator).
10. The candidate may submit a “stop list”. Letters should not be solicited from people whose name appears on this list.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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

---

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

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 Wednesday, November 5, 2025.**

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 and an invitation for formal response from the candidate. It is especially important that any significant negative findings be expressed in this memorandum. The memorandum should focus on facts and findings but should not reveal the overall recommendation from the committee or include advice for improvement. Nor should it characterize or refer to external or internal letters in any way. See the sample letter in **Section F: Example Memorandum from Casebook Committee to Candidate** of the *Guidelines*. (Please do not use this as a template, but as an illustration of the level and tone of such letters.) This assessment memorandum is provided to the candidate simultaneously with submission of the casebook to the Department Chair. The memorandum is also included in the casebook (H.C.5). The candidate may respond in writing to the ADAA, with copy to the Department Chair, by November 5, 2025.
2. At the same time casebooks are submitted to the College (on November 5, 2025), Department Chairs will inform candidates of the department's recommendation.
3. The EC will evaluate the casebooks in depth during December 2025 and January 2026. 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 **Wednesday, November 5, 2025.**

## **E. SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS**

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

### **Pre-email to potential external reviewers**

(Optional)

Dear [Professor, Dr., etc.]:

We are considering [candidate and current title of candidate] for [promotion, promotion and tenure, or tenure] to [title with or without tenure]. Professor [\_\_\_\_\_]’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]. If you agree to serve as a reviewer, we will send you the University of Michigan’s required solicitation letter along with additional materials to help in your assessment. Your letter will be due by [deadline here].

**Attachment F-1**  
**Instructional Tenure Track Appointments**  
**Without Joint Appointments**

**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(s)] at the University of Michigan [is/are] considering [Candidate Name] for promotion from the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure] to the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure]. Faculty at the University of Michigan are promoted on the basis of research, scholarly, and creative contributions; teaching ability; 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.

[ONLY FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY SEEKING TENURE: Please keep in mind that at the University of Michigan the criteria for the granting of tenure are the same regardless of the length of a candidate's service as an untenured faculty member. [[ADD THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE IF THE SCHOOL/COLLEGE ONLY ALLOWS ONE ATTEMPT AT TENURE: "Also note that, except in rare circumstances, a review for tenure in [Unit] can only occur once."]) We ask that you be attentive to our policies in your evaluation of [Candidate Name].]

Based on the enclosed materials and any other knowledge you have **about the candidate's** 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 the **candidate's 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 the **candidate's** works?
3. Which, if any, of the scholarly publications or works do you consider to be outstanding?
4. How would you estimate **the candidate's** standing in relation to others **in the** peer group who are working in the same field?
5. How would you evaluate the **candidate's** service contributions to the discipline;

that is, **the candidate's** work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?

6. **With respect to research and scholarly productivity, would the candidate's work meet the requirements for someone being considered for promotion and, if applicable, tenure at your institution? If not, why?**

***[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 not respond, we will note this in the candidate's promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name]  
[Title]

Enclosures

**Attachment F-2**  
**Instructional Tenure Track Promotion with**  
**JOINT ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS**

**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(s)] at the University of Michigan [is/are] considering [Candidate Name] for promotion from the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure] to the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure]. Faculty at the University of Michigan are promoted on the basis of research, scholarly, and creative contributions; teaching ability; 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.

[ONLY FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY SEEKING TENURE: Please keep in mind that at the University of Michigan the criteria for the granting of tenure are the same regardless of the length of a candidate's service as an untenured faculty member. [[ADD THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE IF THE SCHOOL/COLLEGE ONLY ALLOWS ONE ATTEMPT AT TENURE: "Also note that, except in rare circumstances, a review for tenure in [Unit] can only occur once."]] We ask that you be attentive to our policies in your evaluation of [Candidate Name].]

**[Candidate Name] is engaged in research that is interdisciplinary in nature. The candidate holds a joint appointment in the departments of [discipline] and [discipline]. We invite your consideration of the interdisciplinary nature of the candidate's work in your review of their scholarly contributions.**

Based on the enclosed materials and any other knowledge you have **about the candidate's** 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 the **candidate's 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 the **candidate's** works?
3. Which, if any, of the scholarly publications or works do you consider to be outstanding?

4. How would you estimate **the candidate's** standing in relation to others in **the candidate's** peer group who are working in the same field?
5. How would you evaluate **the candidate's** service contributions to the discipline; that is, **the candidate's** work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?
6. **With respect to research and scholarly productivity, would the candidate's work meet the requirements for someone being considered for promotion and, if applicable, tenure at your institution? If not, why?**

***[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 not respond, we will note this in the candidate's promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name]  
[Title]

Enclosures



## Attachment F-4 Research Professor Track Appointments

### 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 professor track. Faculty at the University of Michigan on the research professor 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 **about the candidate's** 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 the **candidate's 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 **the candidate's** works?
3. Which, if any, of the scholarly publications or works do you consider to be outstanding?
4. How would you estimate **the candidate's** standing in relation to others **in the candidate's** peer group who are working in the same field?
5. How would you evaluate **the candidate's** service contributions to the discipline; that is, **the candidate's** work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?
6. **With respect to research and scholarly productivity, would the candidate's work meet the requirements for someone being considered for promotion at your institution? If not, why?**

***[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 not respond, we will note this in the candidate's promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Title]

Enclosures

## 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 **about the candidate's** 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 **the candidate's 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 **the candidate's** works?
3. Which, if any, of the scholarly publications or works do you consider to be outstanding?
4. How would you estimate **the candidate's** standing in relation to others **in the candidate's** peer group who are working in the same field?
5. How would you evaluate **the candidate's** service contributions to the discipline; that is, **the candidate's** work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?
6. **With respect to research and scholarly productivity, would the candidate's work meet the requirements for someone being considered for promotion at your institution? If not, why?**

***[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 not respond, we will note this in the candidate's 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 and tenure casebook committee of [TITLE] [NAME], who is being considered for [tenure and promotion | promotion] to the rank of [TITLE]. 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 useful in our committee's deliberations, we would need your comments by [deadline]. I thank you in advance for your time and effort.

## **Undergraduate Solicitation Letter (not required for research faculty)**

Dear <NAME>:

We are considering <candidate name> for possible <promotion/tenure, promotion, tenure> to <proposed rank> in the <department name>. As part of this process, our committee solicits letters from selected students to assist us in evaluating the candidate's effectiveness in <his/her> interactions with undergraduate students. We are asking you to supply such input as one of <candidate name>'s students. Please provide a letter addressing your experiences with <candidate name> as a classroom teacher and also as a research mentor as it may pertain to you. If you have any questions, please contact <name> at <email>. We would like to receive your letter by <date>. We are able to accept letters sent via email if they are sent from your umich.edu account.

Thank you for your assistance in this important process.

Regards,  
<Name>

## **Graduate Student Solicitation Letter (not required for research faculty)**

Dear <NAME>:

We are considering <candidate name> for possible <promotion/tenure, promotion, tenure> to <proposed rank> in the <department name>. As part of this process, our committee solicits letters from selected students to assist us in evaluating the candidate's effectiveness in <his/her> interactions with graduate students. We are asking you to supply such input as one of <candidate name>'s students. Please provide a letter addressing your experiences with <candidate name> as a research mentor and also as a classroom instructor as it may pertain to you. If you have any questions, please contact <name> at <email>. We would like to receive your letter by <date>. We are able to accept letters sent via email if they are sent from your umich.edu account.

Thank you for your assistance in this important process.

Regards,  
<Name>

## 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. **Please do not include the committee's recommendation in this memorandum. Do not refer to reviewer letters.**

### EXAMPLE

To: Professor 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, **which includes both internal and external evaluation**, 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 the [Department Chair] and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs 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 are outstanding and you received the XXX Award for teaching. Students view you as accessible and a conscientious teacher. 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 many 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 from a variety of external sponsors. In particular your contributions in area YYY have been well-cited and influential in the field.

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 as lead or senior author in top-tier forums. 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 internal service contributions demonstrate excellent citizenship, with quantity of service exceeding expectations for a junior faculty member. For external service, you have performed some reviewing but have not yet taken an active role in professional activities.

You have served your department as a contributing member of the ZZZ committee. To date you have not taken a leadership role in internal service. Externally, you are highly active as a contributor to technical program committees and play a leading role in activities of the ABC Society.

## **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](mailto:sfolsom@umich.edu).

For those reviewers quoted in the promotion recommendation, please indicate the reviewer by labeling an additional electronic 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 email them to Sherry Hall at [sfolsom@umich.edu](mailto:sfolsom@umich.edu). (*Do not include quotes from internal letters.*)

Once the ADAA Office submits casebooks to the Provost'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.



## **H. DETAILED INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF *TENURE, RESEARCH PROFESSOR TRACK, AND RESEARCH SCIENTIST TRACK* CASEBOOKS**

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>A.</b>	<b>Three page promotion and/or tenure recommendation prepared by the Chair and/or advisory or executive committee.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>Cover letter prepared by the Dean.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>C.</b>	<b>Chair/Department Letters .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>D.</b>	<b>Curriculum Vitae.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>E.</b>	<b>Documentation of Teaching.....</b>	<b>28</b>
	Committee's Evaluation of Teaching .....	28
	Comparison Report .....	27
<b>F.</b>	<b>Documentation of Research .....</b>	<b>30</b>
	Committee's Evaluation of Research and Impact.....	30
	Ranking of Journals .....	30
	Candidate's own ranking of journals/conferences.....	30
	Committee's ranking of journals/conferences.....	30
<b>G.</b>	<b>Documentation of Service .....</b>	<b>31</b>
	Committee's Evaluation of Service .....	31
<b>H.</b>	<b>Brief Description of Credentials of External Reviewers and Relationship to Candidate ..</b>	<b>32</b>
	External reviewers (listed alphabetically by last name) who provided review letters .....	32
	External Reviewers who did not provide review letter .....	32
<b>I.</b>	<b>Sample Letter Sent to External Reviewers.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>J.</b>	<b>Evaluation Letters by all External Reviewers.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>K.</b>	<b>Evaluation Letters by Internal Reviewers.....</b>	<b>36</b>
	<b>Appendix – Records of Communications.....</b>	<b>37</b>

## SUMMARY DOCUMENTS

### A. Promotion and/or tenure recommendation prepared by the Chair and/or advisory or executive committee

*To be drafted by the department but will not be included in the Executive Committee's casebook.*

[See [http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion\\_guidelines/AttachmentD.pdf](http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/AttachmentD.pdf)] **Tenure track only.** A MS Word template is also available at: <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/admin/ptr/>.

- A minimum of five quotes is required. For those reviewers quoted in the three page recommendation, indicate the reviewer by labeling an additional copy of the letters as Reviewer A, Reviewer B, Reviewer C, etc. **REMINDER:** Please use the additional copy of the letters to highlight the text used for quotes. (*Do not include quotes from internal reviewers.*) This additional copy should be sent as a pdf file (one file per candidate) to Sherry Hall (sfolsom).

### B. Dean's Cover Letter

- The ADAA Office will prepare this section.

### C. 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. Provide a 2-3 sentence assessment on what **substantive impact** the candidate's research or scholarly work has had either within their own field or more broadly. It 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 and/or abstentions.**
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 and/or abstentions.** According to the 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/**Program** Chair/**Director**.  
**Required** if the candidate has an academic appointment in another school or department (regardless of effort). **This will include faculty in the Macromolecular Science and Engineering Program (Macro) and the Engineering Education Research Program (EER).** 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.

**D. Curriculum Vitae and Summary of Contributions to and major impact on Teaching, Research, and Service**

- 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: <https://adaa.engin.umich.edu/admin/ptr/>.
- The template for the Summary of contributions to and major impact on teaching, research, and service is located on the ADAA website at: <https://adaa.engin.umich.edu/admin/ptr/>

Briefly summarize your major contributions to teaching, research, and service. The teaching discussion may include undergraduate, graduate, and professional education contributions in all learning delivery modalities, including traditional and remote classrooms. The summary may also include contributions to tech transfer and entrepreneurship, as well as broader impact-focused activities, if applicable.

**Total length may not exceed four pages.**

## E. 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. If quoting internal and student reviewers with labels, please distinguish them from the external reviewers. For example, Internal Reviewer A, Graduate Student A, Undergraduate Student A and include these labels in internal and student lists in SmartPath.

Note: For research faculty classroom teaching is not a criterion for promotion. Emphasis should be on non-didactic teaching if any, otherwise please mark this section as N/A. Please do not include Q scores for research scientists for courses taught as a lecturer.

### Committee's Evaluation of Teaching

(Two page maximum)

The template for this is located on the ADAA website at:

<http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/admin/ptr/> Please do not edit the format of the template or remove any headings.

Overall assessment of candidate's teaching contributions including: classroom instruction; innovation in course content, learning delivery modality, or pedagogy in undergraduate, graduate, and professional education; conduct and supervision of laboratory instruction; mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in research; supervision of field work; and supervision of clinical and practicum experiences. The narrative should specifically address the specified criteria (see Appendix I) for promotion to the rank under consideration. **REMINDER:** For faculty members with interdisciplinary appointments, please comment on contributions to interdisciplinary activities with regards to teaching.

The committee may optionally refer to student comments from teaching evaluations if appropriate.

### Comparison Report [optional]

The template for this is located on the ADAA website at:

<http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/admin/ptr/> Please do not edit the format of the template.

If the casebook committee would find it informative to compare the candidate's teaching record with other instructors teaching the same or similar courses, they may provide such information in the form of a Teaching Comparison Report. This information is available from the Registrar's Office.

A Comparison Report offers more precise detail and allows the unit to select appropriate courses for comparison of the candidate's record with those of departmental peers. Key principles for generating the Report are:

- Group the same or similar courses that have been taught by five of the candidate's teaching colleagues. The courses selected for this comparison should have been taught during roughly the same time period. Provide a brief rationale (1-2 paragraphs) for the comparison courses and faculty selected for the Comparison Report. Note: If comparison data are not available for the same course, then select comparisons with similar courses in terms of level and size.
- It is permissible to group together different courses taught by the candidate if the unit believes they are similar, and then to establish comparisons to this group of courses.

- The Comparison Report will include either the word “candidate” or the rank of the faculty member whose E&E data you have selected for the comparison. **Please do not include the comparison faculty names in the table.**

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Course #</i>	<i>Course title</i>	<i>Teaching Role<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Enrollment/Responses</i>	<i>Q1</i>	<i>Q2</i>	<i>Q4</i>
Candidate								
Candidate								
Candidate								
Candidate								
Faculty 1 (rank)								
Faculty 2 (rank)								
Faculty 3 (rank)								
Faculty 4 (rank)								
Faculty 5 (rank)								

(1): Co-instructor, recitation/discussion leader, sole instructor

## **F. 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. If quoting internal and student reviewers with labels, please distinguish them from the external reviewer labels. For example, Internal Reviewer A, Graduate Student A, Undergraduate Student A and include these labels in internal and student lists in SmartPath.

### **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/admin/ptr/> Please do not edit the format of the template or remove any headings.

- 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/admin/ptr/> Please do not edit the format of the template or remove any headings.

#### **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 and conferences 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 applicable.

#### **G. 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. If quoting internal and student reviewers with labels, please distinguish them from the external reviewers. For example, Internal Reviewer A, Graduate Student A, Undergraduate Student A and include these labels in internal and student lists in SmartPath.

**The template for this is located on the ADAA website at:**

<http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/admin/ptr/> Please do not edit the format of the template or remove any headings.

#### **Committee's Evaluation of Service**

##### **(One page maximum)**

Overall assessment of candidate's contributions to internal and external service (separately). Emphasize impact of activities over mere participation to the extent known. The narrative should specifically address the specified criteria (see Appendix I) for promotion to the rank under consideration.



#### **H. 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 J 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.

**The following information should be provided for description of the external reviewer:**

- 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).

**REMINDER:** For a non-academic external reviewer, please 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.

#### **External Reviewers who provided letters after the department vote.**

SmartPath will generate a list of reviewers solicited but provided their letter after the department vote. (You are not required to refer to this letter or revise reviewer labels in the department chair's letter or the committee's letter.)

## **I. 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.

## J. Evaluation Letters by all External Reviewers

A minimum of five external arm's length letters are required, of which at least two must be from the committee's list. The external reviewers must hold a rank at or above the rank considered for the candidate. 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](http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/procedures.html)

Whereas 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 a large cooperative/research consortium that publishes abstracts and manuscripts with an inclusive set of co-authors, the outside reviewer can be considered arm's length if they have not personally interacted in the research effort. In these cases, provide a statement with the bio noting the absence of a direct collaboration.

No more than two external reviewers from the same institution are allowed.

Departments must contact any external reviewer if their letter does not specify the rank/title considered for the candidate and ask that they indicate their support in a revised letter or in an email reply. Reviewer responses must be included in the casebook.

In addition to the above rank requirement, the following track requirements apply\*:

- External reviewers who are tenured faculty can review all promotion casebooks for the Instructional tenure track, Research Professor track, and Clinical Instructional track.
- External reviewers who are Clinical Instructional track faculty can only review promotion casebooks for the Clinical Instructional track.
- External reviewers who are Research Professor track faculty can only review promotion casebooks for the Research Professor track.

\* This does not apply to research scientist track casebooks. External reviewers must be at or above the rank of the candidate. Example: Assistant Professors on the tenure track, are not at the appropriate rank to review a candidate as Associate Research Scientist, per UMOR.

**We expect all letters will be uploaded 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's Office 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's Office 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.

## K. Evaluation Letters by Internal Reviewers

SmartPath will generate a list of all internal faculty and student reviewers solicited.

- Faculty (include a minimum of 2 letters from faculty at or above the rank proposed)
- Students (undergraduate and graduate students, for a total of 6–8 letters). **Not required for the research scientist track.**
  - Within SmartPath, the department will provide the information noted in the table below.<sup>2</sup> The information may be added to the Evaluator Bio and Relationship fields in SmartPath for each student.
  - A minimum of two letters must come from graduate students, with priority to students mentored in research.
  - A minimum of four undergraduate student letters is required and at least one must come from the committee's list and not be a member of the candidate's research group.

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.

---

<sup>2</sup> Selection of undergraduate students: Letters from a wide range of students are desirable. Therefore, letters should be solicited from students at different performance level. The faculty candidate will recommend half of the names of undergraduate students, and the committee, through the department advising office, will identify the other half. Letters will be solicited from this cohort.

## **Appendix – Records of Communications**

**Sample emails will be generated here via SmartPath**

- 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. Include a copy of the email sent to all students.

*I: Statement of Criteria for Promotion and Tenure, University of Michigan, College of Engineering*

SmartPath will include the appropriate promotion criteria statement in a link of materials for reviewers.  
**If soliciting reviewers outside SmartPath is necessary, include a link to the criteria in the email request.**

See the following pages for the applicable statements of criteria.

## Principles for Promotion/Tenure Evaluation

By articulating criteria for tenure and promotion of tenure-track faculty, the College of Engineering aims to promote transparency, and provide guidance to candidates, mentors, and evaluators of promotion cases. Tenure-track faculty are evaluated based on excellence of contributions to teaching, research, and service, as elaborated below. It is also important to emphasize some general principles for promotion/tenure evaluation.

1. Faculty are expected to uphold the [values of the College of Engineering](#), and consideration of these values pervades the evaluation process.
2. The overriding criterion for excellence is *impact*, broadly interpreted. We encourage faculty to pursue highly innovative and creative solutions to the most challenging problems, recognizing that not every daring idea can be expected to fully succeed.
3. Specific factors and measures reported in the casebook and discussed below are generally not objectives in themselves; rather, they are proxies for or evidence of contribution and impact. Evaluators are cautioned against over-reliance on readily quantified metrics as opposed to qualitative or holistic assessments of impact based on all available evidence.
4. Engineering at Michigan encompasses a diverse set of disciplines, covering many different methodologies and norms of scholarly communication, and admitting a variety of ways of expressing contributions to teaching, research, and service. Candidates should be evaluated with respect to the standards of their own fields, including interdisciplinary work.
5. Cases are assessed based on the candidate's full path of achievement, including but not limited to cumulative contribution and rate at the time of assessment. There is no strict minimum time in rank for tenure or promotion consideration. Experience suggests that it typically takes the full tenure clock or, respectively, at least six active years as associate to demonstrate the requisite criteria for promotion.
6. Not all contributions fit neatly into one of the major categories of teaching, research, and service. In particular, mentoring plays an important role in all three, as does activity in support of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI).
7. The criteria below are described qualitatively in text, with bulleted lists summarizing key expectations in each major area. These are not to be read as checklists, however. The standard for tenure and promotion is that the criteria be substantially met across the board, which may not necessitate that every single item be satisfied to the letter.



## Teaching

Excellence in teaching is measured by the quality of classroom instruction, impact on the curriculum, and the advising of students. In assessing teaching, evaluators need to be sensitive to limitations of information in the standard record, and problems of according too much weight to single measures (e.g., evaluation scores) or sources (e.g., an individual student letter).

**Classroom instruction.** Excellence in classroom instruction is evident in all learning delivery modalities and may be demonstrated from examination of syllabi and class materials, teaching evaluations, faculty peer evaluations, student feedback, and promotion of DEI in teaching. Demonstration of breadth in level and topic across courses taught is valued, recognizing that departmental needs may constrain which classes candidates can teach.

**Impact on curriculum.** Significant impact on the undergraduate, graduate, or professional education curriculum can be made through the development of a new course or program, course revision, or innovations in teaching methods. Evidence might include syllabi and class material, documentation of innovations in teaching, course revision or development, and publications or presentations about teaching innovations.

**Mentoring, advising, and supervision.** Faculty are expected to engage individually to guide students at the undergraduate and graduate levels. This might include mentoring/advising of undergraduate students, mentoring/advising of graduate students and postdoctoral researchers (including service on PhD committees), directing undergraduate major projects, advising student teams or clubs, supervising UROP students, and supervision of field work, clinical, or practicum experiences.

**Additional evidence of excellence in teaching.** There are other opportunities to demonstrate excellence in teaching, including short courses and workshops taught, development of distance learning programs, outreach related to teaching, participating in or development of activities to support DEI as related to teaching, and development of co-curricular opportunities.

Associate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Developing record of excellence in course instruction at both undergraduate and graduate levels</li><li>● Course development, course revision, or innovation in classroom technique</li><li>● Building a record of effectively advising students at multiple levels</li></ul>
Full	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Sustained record of excellence in teaching contributing to program educational mission</li><li>● Course development, course revision, or innovation in classroom technique</li><li>● Sustained record of effectively advising students at multiple levels</li></ul>

## Research

Excellence in research is measured by the novelty and significance of the ideas and discoveries produced by the candidate's research. Significance in turn is manifest as impact—on the academy and scientific communities, and on engineering practice and society. A successful researcher has built a clear and independent scientific identity, defined by field(s) of inquiry, problems addressed, techniques employed, and contributions credited to the researcher.

**Publication.** Scholarship is documented by a record of publication. Publishing norms vary by engineering discipline, so a record must be judged relative to the forms of publication and venues (e.g., journal, conference, both/other) considered most salient within the candidate's field. Prestige and selectivity of a venue may be indicative of a publication's significance. Impact of a publication can be evidenced by its influence on subsequent literature and practice, and assessments of experts in the field. For collaborative works, degree and independence of contribution needs to be assessed.

Associate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● building record of scholarly publication in salient forums for candidate's field</li><li>● evidence of publication impact</li></ul>
Full	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● sustained record of contribution to scholarly literature</li><li>● substantial cumulative evidence of publication impact</li></ul>

**Mentoring of PhD Students and Postdocs.** A key means by which researchers exert influence and achieve impact is by training future generations of researchers. Working with teams of student researchers and (sometimes) postdoctoral fellows and junior research faculty is the primary mode of research at Michigan Engineering.

Associate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● established a research group</li><li>● mentee co-authorship of publications</li><li>● one or more PhD students at or near completion</li></ul>
Full	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● sustained record of success in mentoring</li><li>● maintaining a pipeline of students</li><li>● effective placement of graduated students and post-docs</li></ul>

**Funding.** Securing externally sponsored funds is essential to maintaining a robust research program over time. Available sources and magnitude of funding required may vary by area, and thus it is necessary to assess funding success relative to the candidate's research enterprise. Success in obtaining competitive grants also demonstrates the ability to identify targets of value and in need of research effort, and persuading sponsors of the quality and worth of one's research production.

Associate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● successful acquisition of sponsored research funds as a principal investigator</li><li>● evidence of ability to secure resources necessary to support the candidate's research program</li></ul>
-----------	--

Full	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● sustained record of funding, ideally from diverse sources, commensurate with maintaining a robust and leading research program in the candidate's area</li> </ul>
------	--

**Additional evidence of excellence in research.** There are other valid indicators of excellence in research that do not directly fall into the above categories, for example: patents and translational activity; influence in policy or public discourse on technical matters; demonstrated impact on society or human health; demonstrated impact on engineering or manufacturing practices.

**Overall Research Impact and Visibility.** Research impact is best evaluated with reference to specific contributions and accomplishments, for example as attested in letters from internal and external experts. A reputation of primary association with a particular achievement or subject is strong evidence of research leadership. In addition to production in specific categories above, visibility can be reflected by awards, invitations to present at prestigious institutions and forums, external service (criteria defined below), public engagement, and media reports.

Associate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● emerging leader</li> <li>● developing reputation in field based on identified research contributions</li> </ul>
Full	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● recognized leader</li> <li>● established reputation in field based on sustained record of contributions</li> </ul>

## Service

Excellence in service is measured by contribution to governance, both internally at the University of Michigan and externally to the academic community and broader society. Documented quality and impact of service performed is more important than quantity of service activity per se. Outreach and other activities in support of diversity, equity, and inclusion are valued forms of service, both internal (e.g., for recruiting to Michigan or on behalf of a University activity) and external (e.g., for broadening participation in a field or serving societal need). Service leadership is demonstrated by responsibility taken in appointed roles, and innovation in identifying and addressing service needs.

**Internal.** Faculty are expected to be conscientious citizens and contribute to the governance of their academic units. Internal service comprises effective work in support of the mission of the candidate's department, college, and university. Scope and responsibility of internal service contributions are relative to unit needs, and expected to increase with seniority.

Associate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● demonstration of good citizenship in service to department</li> <li>● collaborative work on committees or other internal service tasks</li> </ul>
Full	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● effective leadership service to department, college, and/or university</li> <li>● sustained record of productive interactions and collaborative service</li> </ul>

**External.** Faculty are expected to engage with external institutions maintaining the research enterprise, including professional societies, government agencies (or other research sponsors), publishers, and others. Such engagement produces goodwill and visibility for the candidate (and, by representation, the University of Michigan), and provides opportunity for impact on the wider academic and research community.

Associate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● demonstration of good citizenship in service to professional community</li><li>● fulfillment of trust roles such as reviewing and meeting organization</li></ul>
Full	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● effective leadership service to professional community</li><li>● sustained record of service in a variety of capacities, impact on community</li></ul>

**Research faculty rank criteria for appointment and promotion.**

Available at <https://research.umich.edu/policies-on-appointments-and-promotions-for-research-scientist-track/>. SmartPath will provide the criteria in the link of materials to reviewers.

See the following page for criteria.

Performance area			Research Investigator (RI)	Research Scientist Track			Research Professor Track		
				Assistant Research Scientist (aRS)	Associate Research Scientist (ARS)	Research Scientist (RS)	Research Assistant Professor (RaP)	Research Associate Professor (RAP)	Research Professor (RP)
Scholarship	OVPR CRITERIA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Entry Position - Doctoral, MD, PhD or equivalent</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Potential for scholarly development, possibly as part of a larger research program</li><li>Record of peer-reviewed publications</li><li>Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>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</li><li>Record of peer-reviewed publications</li><li>Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Strong national and international scholarly reputation on the basis of sustained research productivity and contributions</li><li>Substantial record of peer-reviewed publications</li><li>Significant, sustained participation in relevant academic or professional meetings</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Strong local and growing national scholarly reputation on the basis of research productivity and contributions over several years</li><li>Record of peer-reviewed publications</li><li>Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Strong local and national reputation on the basis of research productivity and contributions over several years <b>consistent with that of a tenured associate professor</b></li><li>Substantial record of peer-reviewed publications, including papers as first, lead or senior author</li><li>Significant, sustained participation in relevant academic or professional meetings</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Exemplary and sustained national and international reputation and achievements equivalent to a tenured professor</li></ul>
	Implementation of criteria	Performance		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Potential, possibly as part of a large program</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Productive over several years, possibly as part of a large program</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Sustained productivity and contributions</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Potential</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Productivity and contributions similar to Tenure Track</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Exemplary and sustained, similar to Tenure Track</li></ul>
		Peer-reviewed Publications		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Some, as a result of PhD or postdoctoral training</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Growing Record publications: although majority of contribution may be part of large author teams, demonstration of leading the output, writing of some scholarly work expected as typically measured as lead author on some publications</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Substantial record</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Some, as a result of prior training</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Substantial record of productivity</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Exemplary record of productivity</li></ul>
		Professional Community		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Participation</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Participation</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Significant and sustained participation</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Participation</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Significant and sustained participation</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Exemplary and sustained participation</li></ul>
		Reputation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Potential</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Strong local and growing national</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Strong national and international</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Potential</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Strong local and national</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Strong national and International</li></ul>
		Impact		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Some</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Significant</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Significant</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Significant</li></ul>
	Independence	OVPR CRITERIA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Independence not required or planned for</li><li>Plan for supporting role</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Independence not required or planned for, but would strengthen the case</li><li>Plan for supporting role</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A Record of independent scholarship/scientific contributions, and/or</li><li>Significant scientific managerial responsibilities such as supervision and mentorship of other research faculty</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Plans and development for independence</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Independent scholarship and independent funding such as serving as PI, multiple PI, and/or lead of substantive portions of multiple research grants (at comparable level to tenure track)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Independent scholarship and independent, sustained funding such as serving as PI, multiple PI, and/or lead of substantive portions of multiple research grants (at comparable level to tenure track)</li></ul>
Implementation of criteria		Intellectual		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None, but may be developing</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Developing</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Strong evidence</li><li>Evidence of substantial supervisory role over defined area, e.g., Core Director</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Developing line of inquiry</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Strong evidence of independence</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Complete</li></ul>
		Funding		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None required</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Evidence of proposal efforts as Co-I</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Evidence of success with external funding as PI or Co-PI/MPI or substantive Co-I role with fiscal responsibility (may be modest size award, including modest size foundation, industry and other small external funds or Site PI / Co-I w scientific and fiscal responsibility for a core or clearly-delineated scientific aim)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None, but developing collaborations</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Evidence of independent scholarship and independent funding such as serving as PI, multiple PI, and/or lead of substantive portions of multiple research grants (at comparable level to tenure track)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Complete, sustained</li></ul>
Teaching	OVPR CRITERIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No formal requirement for teaching</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No formal requirement for teaching</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No formal requirement for teaching</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No formal requirement for teaching</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No formal requirement for teaching</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No formal requirement for teaching</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>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</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>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</li></ul>
	Implementation of criteria	Non-didactic		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None required</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None required</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Participation in student/trainee/learner mentoring</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None required</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Substantial record</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Substantial record</li></ul>
		Didactic		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None required</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None required</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None required</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None required</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None required</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None required</li></ul>
Service	Internal		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No formal requirement</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No formal requirement</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Some</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Significant</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None required</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Substantial (less than Tenure Track)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Substantial (less than Tenure Track)</li></ul>
	External		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No formal requirement</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Expected / Some</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Some</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Expected</li></ul>
Time in Rank Policy			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>OVPR does not approve but must be notified</li><li>OVPR does not approve but must be notified</li><li>Maximum time in rank, 4 years</li><li>Movement to aRS or RaP at Dept level</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>OVPR does not approve but must be notified of new appointments or promotion to aRS</li><li>Maximum time in rank, 6 years (time in rank extension requests permitted)</li><li>During 6th year of appointment, unit must complete a full review and submit to OVPR for approval. As a result of this review:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Candidate may be promoted to: <b>ARS, RaP, RAP</b> as appropriate</li><li>-Candidate may be transitioned to staff position or terminated</li></ul></li></ul>	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>During 6th year of appointment, unit must complete a full review and submit to OVPR and the Provost's Office for approval. NOTE: Michigan Medicine provides for this review in the 7th year of appointment</li><li>Candidate may be transitioned to staff position or terminated</li></ul>	N/A	N/A

\*Units that report to OVPR must submit recommendations for promotions to the respective Associate Vice President for Research for promotions to the ranks of Assistant Research Scientist or higher

## PROVIDED FOR INFORMATION ONLY – DO NOT INCLUDE IN CASEBOOK

*J: Qualifications for Appointment and Promotion in the Several Faculties of the University of Michigan*

Since the University of Michigan is responsible for maintaining high standards of teaching, research, and service to the people of the state in a wide variety of fields, it is essential that its faculties be composed of men and women with superior personal and professional qualifications. The following statement is issued for the guidance of administrative officers and of other members of the staff who are responsible for ensuring that all persons appointed or promoted in the several faculties are thoroughly qualified to discharge the duties of their respective positions.

Teaching. Essential qualifications for appointment or promotion are character and the ability to teach, whether at the undergraduate or the graduate level. Some of the elements to be evaluated are experience, knowledge of subject matter, skill in presentation, interest in students, ability to stimulate youthful minds, capacity for cooperation, and enthusiastic devotion to teaching. The responsibility of the teacher as a guide and friend properly extends beyond the walls of the classroom into other phases of the life of the student as a member of the University community. It also involves the duty of initiating and improving educational methods both within and outside the departments.

Research. All members of the faculties must be persons of scholarly ability and attainments. Their qualifications are to be evaluated on the quality of their published and other creative work, the range and variety of their intellectual interests, their success in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods, and their participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals. Attainment may be in the realm of scientific investigation, in the realm of constructive contributions, or in the realm of the creative arts.

Service. The scope of the University's activities makes it appropriate for members of the staff to engage in many activities outside of the fields of teaching and research. These may include participation in committee work and other administrative tasks, counseling, clinical duties, and special training programs. The University also expects many of its staff to render extramural services to schools, to industry, to local, state, and national agencies, and to the public at large.

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

In making their recommendation for either appointment or promotion, the responsible departments and colleges will study the whole record of each candidate. To warrant recommendation for initial appointment, candidates must have given evidence either here or elsewhere of their ability to handle satisfactorily the duties of the positions in question. To warrant recommendation for promotions, candidates must have shown superior ability in at least one phase of their activities and substantial contribution in other phases. Naturally, persons who make a distinguished contribution in all aspects of their work may expect more rapid promotion than persons of more limited achievement.

Promotion is not automatic nor does it simply depend on length of service. All promotions are recommended and made on the basis of demonstrated merit. The University endeavors to recognize distinguished performance by adequate increases in salary and early promotion. For this reason a call to another position is not by itself considered a sufficient reason for promotion but may be one of the factors to be taken into consideration in the timing of a promotion.

It is assumed that, as members of the staff mature in experience, they will become more effective teachers and scholars. To that extent the qualifications for appointment and promotion will be progressively more exacting at each successive rank. In particular, promotion to the rank of associate professor, which entails indeterminate tenure, will be approved only when a person has given such clear evidence of ability that they may be expected, in due season, to attain a professorship.

Adopted by the Board of Regents, April, 1935, revised April, 1954