

University of Michigan-Dearborn

Department of Education

Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

Approved July 31, 2015 by the DOE Governing Faculty

Updated on Dec. 12, 2016; Sept. 22, 2017; April 19, 2019

Article I. Purpose

AUTHORITY. The statements of the Regents of the University of Michigan in the document entitled Qualifications for Appointment and Promotion in the Several Faculties of the University of Michigan in the Regents' Bylaws and Standard Practice Guide are the bases of the following Guidelines for the Department of Education (DOE) of the University of Michigan-Dearborn (UM-Dearborn).

SCOPE. The Guidelines have been developed to inform and guide the faculty, their elected or appointed faculty representatives, and the DOE administrators in their interpretation and implementation of standards and procedures relating to tenure-track faculty appointments, promotions, and the awarding of tenure.

Article II. Appointments, Policies, and Procedures

Normally, initial appointments at the DOE are made without tenure, and the terms of the probationary period are specified in the letter of appointment, which is prepared and sent by the Department Chair. The decision related to credit for previous college-level teaching experience is made by the Dean. A maximum of three years of such service may be credited toward the UM-Dearborn probationary period of appointees at the level of assistant professor. Decisions on tenure for appointees previously holding tenure at the rank of associate professor or professor are usually made no earlier than the second, nor later than the third year at UM-Dearborn. In those instances of appointments with immediate tenure (usually done only in association with administrative appointments for chancellors, provosts, deans, and department chairs), approval of the Regents must be obtained before the offer of appointment may be finalized.

Article III. Periodic Faculty Reviews and Reports

Once appointed, all instructors and assistant professors will be assigned a mentor from the tenured faculty. The instructor or assistant professor may suggest his/her mentor. Following the Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (TPAC) recommendation, the Department Chair shall approve the assignment of a mentor. Through faculty mentoring a more senior faculty member shares his/her experience, expertise, and advice regarding teaching, research, service, and other professional development issues. A mentor may serve as a guide about the institution and its culture, as a teaching resource, as a research advisor, and/or as a role model.

The DOE conducts three different but interrelated reviews for the consideration of promotion and tenure: (1) annual review, (2) first and second progress reviews, and (3) formal review for the tenure decision.

Annual Reviews and Reports

At the end of each academic year, every full-time probationary DOE faculty member is required to prepare a written report on his/her recent professional activities: teaching, research, and service. The Chair and the Dean shall review the reports submitted by probationary faculty with attention to their performance in all relevant areas and identify issues that pertain to the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure. Following this review, the Chair shall meet with each probationary faculty member and his/her mentor to discuss the annual review.

Mid-Term Reviews and Reports for Assistant Professors

The first and second progress reviews are normally conducted in the non-tenured faculty's second and fourth years of service.

A quorum of tenured faculty members who hold Senate rank, constituting themselves as a committee of the whole TPAC, shall meet no later than April 30th to review the non-tenured faculty's progress toward tenure and promotion. The faculty member being reviewed must submit his/her electronic credential portfolio to the TPAC Chair by the second Wednesday in February. All credentials submitted for review will be maintained securely.

A subcommittee of two tenured faculty members will review each probationary faculty's credentials and report to the TPAC. The TPAC will discuss and approve the report. In the case of a positive review, the TPAC Chair will provide the faculty member with a letter regarding his/her progress toward tenure and promotion. The letter will be forwarded to the Dean.

Approved Department of Education Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

In the first or second progress review, the TPAC may determine that the faculty member has made insufficient progress and thus recommend termination. In such cases, the TPAC will prepare a letter summarizing the basis for the negative judgment and recommendation per TPAC's desires, and the Department Chair will transmit the letter to the Dean. (Note: The TPAC Chair and Department Chair might not be represented by the same person.) In addition to the TPAC letter, the Department Chair will write a separate letter, whether in agreement or disagreement. The Department Chair will forward these letters to the Dean. The Dean will forward the letter or letters to the faculty member; the letter(s) may be supplemented by additional comments from the Dean or Executive Committee regarding the negative judgment and/or the termination recommendation. The Dean will consider all documentation and supplemental materials to make the final decision.

Progress Reviews and Reports for Associate Professors

The first progress review of a tenured associate professor will be in the third year following promotion to associate professor and continue in three-year cycles until promoted to full professor. Tenured associate professors, at any time prior to promotion to full professor, may request an informal review of the credential portfolio. No observations of teaching will be required for the informal progress review; however, classroom observations may be conducted per the tenured associate professor's request or if there are concerns about the person's teaching (e.g., per course evaluations, student concerns). The Department Chair and/or Dean would make the decision to require classroom observations.

Tenured associate faculty shall have the option to request a review in a specific year for progress toward or promotion to full professor. The request shall be made by the candidate to the TPAC Chair no later than January 15th.

A subcommittee will be comprised of two Senate rank, full professors. The subcommittee will submit a written report to TPAC who will discuss and approve the report. The TPAC Chair will provide the faculty member with a copy of the report regarding his/her progress toward promotion to full professor. The letter will be forwarded to the Dean.

Article IV. Areas of Evaluation

The University of Michigan–Dearborn endorses the teacher-scholar model rather than the research-scholar model. We seek faculty who value and are committed to excellence in teaching and research. We believe the two are inextricably linked and that on-going research contributes to the intellectual vitality characteristic of quality classroom instruction. The foci of evaluation from assistant to associate professor will thus be on effectiveness in teaching and research performance; however, service should not be neglected. Of particular importance is the assessment of the candidate's potential for significant and continuing contributions to the discipline, department, unit, and campus. For promotion to Professor with tenure, continued

Approved Department of Education Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

high-quality teaching and research, leadership in scholarly activities, and service to discipline, department, unit, campus, and the profession are expected.

Clinical instructional and clinical research appointments are without tenure and therefore are not subject to the tenure process, but may be promoted in line with the guidelines and the policies established herein.

In all required faculty reviews and in all recommendations related to promotion or tenure or both, faculty must be evaluated in three areas: (1) teaching, (2) research, and (3) service. The evaluation shall be based on the materials included in the credential portfolio. In official 4 documents recommending promotion or tenure, the terms to be used in characterizing levels of performance are as follows: (a) excellent, (b) significantly capable, (c) competent, and (d) unacceptable. The criteria and methods of evaluation are clarified in the following section:

Teaching

Instructional activities may include but are not limited to such work as classroom instruction, dissertation/thesis direction, the supervision of independent study, the giving of special academic lectures, and the direction of student research projects. An essential qualification for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure in the DOE is the ability to teach at an excellent or significantly capable level of performance. Some of the elements to be evaluated are knowledge of subject matter, skill in presentation, interest in students, creativity, ability to stimulate thinking, commitment to teaching, reflection, capacity for change or improvement, integrity, versatility, and evidence of cooperation with colleagues and administration in the achievement of the DOE's instructional goals. Acceptable kinds of evidence for evaluating teaching performance shall include student evaluations, teaching portfolios, and peer reviews.

Teaching-related activities may include but are not limited to:

- Classroom instruction
- Promotion and supervision of undergraduate and graduate student research
- Development of new/online courses, and/or resurrection of dormant courses
- Curricular or program development
- Participation in teaching development activities (e.g. attending teaching workshops)
- Seeking or obtaining pedagogical grants
- Producing curricular or pedagogical materials
- Guest lecturer
- Involvement in assessment activities
- Participation in service learning activities
- Implementing new teaching technologies

REQUIRED evidence for evaluating teaching performance includes:

Approved Department of Education Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

1. **Teaching Narrative.** This narrative should address objectives, methodologies, pedagogy, philosophy, and teaching development. Also, it should include a discussion of, or response to, teaching evaluations and/or peer observation reports and any action taken to correct problems or difficulties. It shall be the candidate's responsibility to justify the inclusion of any instructional activities under teaching.
2. **Student Evaluations.** Student evaluations are provided through the campuswide student evaluation forms. It should be realized that the primary rationale for and importance of student evaluations are their potential contribution to improved instruction. Such evaluations may also constitute useful evidence in consideration of reappointments, promotions, and tenure. In no case will student evaluations be allowed to constitute the only basis for determining a faculty member's teaching ability.
3. **Teaching Portfolios.** Faculty members should be encouraged to present any materials used in their courses, which can provide evidence of their teaching practices and proficiency. They may also submit, as evidence, a statement of their objectives in 5 various courses and an explanation of their teaching methods. These and other materials should be incorporated into a teaching portfolio.
4. **Peer Reviews of Teaching.** Non-tenured faculty members who are seeking tenure or promotion or both must be observed and reviewed annually by at least one senior faculty member. The reviewers will be appointed by the TPAC. The reviewers will submit a written report to the candidate, his/her mentor, and the TPAC Chair.

Research

An effective teacher-scholar will engage in research that results in peer-reviewed publications. The primary forms of evidence to be evaluated in this area are peer-reviewed artifacts, which are required for promotion and tenure. These are open to evaluation by the faculty member's peers, both internal and external to UM-Dearborn. (See Appendix I for policies concerning obtaining evaluations from relevant outside scholars/reviewers. Selection of external reviewers will be done in accordance with the Standard Practice Guidelines updated annually by the University of Michigan and Promotion Casebook for Instructional Tenured and Tenure-Track, Research Professor Track, and Clinical Instructional Track Faculty Guidelines from the Provost office.)

Both quality and quantity are important factors in the evaluation of publications. While collaboration with one's colleagues is valued, leadership in scholarly activities within the candidate's specific discipline(s) is expected. In deliberations on promotion and tenure, the emphasis in evaluating a faculty member's performance in research should be on determining whether it shows evidence of original, scholarly activity demonstrating a research agenda and publications within the candidate's discipline(s). The publications' contribution to the scholarly field, their impact on the general intellectual community, and the evidence of the author's intellectual vitality and knowledge should be considered also.

Approved Department of Education Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

For these purposes, research includes both writing within a particular discipline and writing of a multi- or interdisciplinary nature. It should be recognized that the professional interests and expertise of many faculty members may not be limited to the area of their official academic appointments, and that original research may often challenge what is presently accepted as “the boundaries of a discipline.” Such writings should be evaluated on their own merit by the members of the discipline and should be credited to the extent that they demonstrate sustained intellectual effort. Publication of research outside of one’s field should be evaluated on the basis of its impact on the general intellectual community and on the basis of evidence it gives of the author’s intellectual vitality and knowledge.

Although publication of research is normally regarded as testimony of its worth to the scholarly world, the quality of a faculty member’s publications must not be evaluated merely by the number of publications alone. Publication in a refereed journal constitutes evidence of the scholarly quality of a work. If works have been accepted for publication but are not yet in print, conclusive documentation must be required to support commitments for publication. Research, for the purpose of the Guidelines, includes publications within a particular discipline, publications of a multi- or interdisciplinary nature, and pedagogical publications. For works in which no scholarly evidence of peer review is available, the external reviewers will evaluate and determine the merit of the work. Regardless of a faculty member’s rank, it is essential that his/her publications appear in peer-reviewed venues. If it is unclear whether a publication has been peer-reviewed or the review process is not evident, it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide information on the review process and to include documentation in the portfolio.

Research-related activities may include but are not limited to:

- Publishing in peer-reviewed venues
- Publishing in conference proceedings
- Securing grant funding
- Editorial responsibilities for scholarly journals
- Promoting and publishing with undergraduate and graduate students
- Collecting or generating research data
- Books or book chapters
- Publishing curricular or pedagogical materials

REQUIRED evidence for evaluating research performance includes:

1. Research Narrative. The narrative should describe one’s scholarly agenda, including a chronicling of the results of scholarly activities with particular emphasis on publications, information on the review processes, and the publication venues. It should also include reflections on one’s development as a scholar and future plans. The narrative may also speak to challenges and concerns about the scholarly endeavors. It shall be the candidate’s responsibility to justify the inclusion of any research activities under research.
2. Documentation of peer-reviewed publications

Approved Department of Education Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

- Copies of peer-reviewed publications (scholarly books, textbooks, journal articles, book chapters)
- Manuscripts accepted, in press, or under contract with acceptance letter(s) and, when appropriate, a copy of a book contract
- Copies of literature review articles only if they demonstrate the breadth of the reviewer's knowledge and make a contribution to research in the area

ADDITIONAL evidence for evaluating research performance may include but are not limited to:

- Grant proposals
- Conference presentations
- Original reports, such as encyclopedia articles
- Copies of relevant correspondence (e.g. concerning work as an expert witness) Supervising undergraduate and/or graduate research
- Manuscripts under review

Faculty members are encouraged, but not required, to submit grant proposals to appropriate agencies. A grant proposal alone is not a substitute for published work. The funding of a grant proposal for the support of scholarly research may be taken as corroborative evidence of one's recognition as a scholar. The candidate is required to show a connection between grant(s) and publication(s). The receipt of an external grant for the support of research may be taken as indication of one's scholarly work. Similarly, a campus grant or training or service grant, which is awarded competitively, may be regarded as evidence of scholarly achievement.

Conference presentations are regarded as evidence of exposure regionally, nationally, or internationally and progress towards the development of a reputation in one's field. The public oral presentation of papers at local, national, and international conferences is highly encouraged.

Review articles of other works should be considered indicative of scholarship only if they demonstrate the breadth of the reviewer's knowledge and make a contribution to scholarship in the area. A simple summary would not satisfy these criteria. However, writing textbooks or original reports such as encyclopedia articles or computer software may, in some fields and in some instances, be regarded as scholarly activity, especially if one is asked to perform such work because of his/her reputation as a scholar.

Faculty members will be judged in the category of research to demonstrate leadership and independence in the ability to produce written results.

Service

An additional qualification for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure in the DOE is service. At an institution in which faculty governance is basic and essential, faculty members should display the willingness and ability to perform a variety of service activities within the discipline, department, college, campus, and university. Indeed, the scope of the University's purposes and goals often require faculty members to engage in activities outside the specific areas of teaching and research pursuits. These activities are grouped under the heading of "service." Additionally, service may include relevant work in the local community and the wider public.

Evidence of service may consist of (1) report from the committee on which the faculty member has served; (2) letter(s) from peer(s) on the same committee; (3) the faculty member's own description of his/her activities with relevant correspondence and documentation; and (4) minutes of meetings.

Service-related activities may include but are not limited to:

- Participation in committee work at a variety of levels (e.g. discipline, department, college, campus, university, professional, and community)
- Membership on task forces and committees for the development and/or evaluation of programs and facilities related to the reshaping or expansion of the Department, College, or University
- Performing administrative duties (e.g. department chair, discipline representative) Mentoring colleagues, either one-on-one or by participating in a mentoring/faculty development workshop. Note that mentoring expectations are greater for tenured than non-tenured faculty.
- Advising students
- Organizing a conference or conference sessions
- Organizing on-campus workshops or presentations for students or faculty
- Organizing off-campus activities for students or faculty
- Holding a non-compensated administrative appointment on the campus
- Holding a chair appointment on a campus committee
- Holding an elected (non-paying) public office
- Occupying a leadership position in a national or regional professional organization
- Providing instruction such as workshops or lectures to the profession or the community
- Serving as a consultant or expert witness
- Media exposure at the international, national, or regional level

In evaluating the quality of service contributions, weight should vary according to the degree of individual participation. For example, a committee chair should receive more credit for his/her work than a committee member, and a member who writes a committee or task force report should receive greater recognition than members who only commented on drafts of the report. Committees that meet more frequently and/or have

especially important charges merit greater weight than other committees in the evaluation of service. For example, serving on search, executive and curriculum committees at any level involve more frequent meetings and more difficult work than the average committee.

The matter of release time and/or additional compensation may also enter into the evaluation of one's participation in committee and/or administrative work. The fact that a faculty member has been given an assignment that merits release time and/or an administrative differential indicates that s/he possesses at least above average skills and the task involves considerable complexity and responsibility.

The degree of participation and/or responsibility in each service activity should be noted in the individual's CV or portfolio.

REQUIRED evidence for evaluating service performance must include:

1. Service Narrative. This narrative should consist of a discussion of the candidate's service contribution. It shall be the candidate's responsibility to justify the inclusion of any service activities under service.
2. A listing of service contributions organized by discipline, department, unit, campus, university, profession, and community. Citations and links to committee or task force reports authored should be included.
3. Supplemental types of evidence of service, such as letters from committee/task force chairs and community partners, news articles, or judgments from committee/task force peers as to the quality of service.

Note that service expectations increase with rank; the quality of service expected for promotion to full professor exceeds expectations for promotion to associate professor.

Article V. Qualifications Necessary for Promotion and Tenure

The three areas of a faculty member's activities discussed above must be central to any evaluation whether annual or progress for promotion and/or tenure. Evaluations of probationary faculty which are unsatisfactory in these areas should lead to non-renewal of appointment. When reappointments or recommendations for promotion and/or tenure are considered, the levels of performance have to be positive in all areas, and four standard terms of evaluation are to be used in official documents: (a) excellent, (b) significantly capable, (c) competent, and (d) unacceptable.

Promotions in the DOE require certain levels of performance in the three categories discussed in Article IV.

Recommendations for promotion must be based on demonstrated appropriate levels of performance. The minimum requirements are that the faculty member: (1) be judged excellent in at least one of the teaching and research categories, (2) be judged at least significantly capable in the other category, and (3) be judged at least competent in

service. Supporting evidence must be provided in every category: in the absence of such evidence, competence will not be assumed.

To Associate Professor

Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor normally includes tenure. Promotion and tenure are critical for both the institution and the individual. Although recommendations for such promotions must be based on demonstrated and appropriate levels of performance, they should be granted only to those who, in addition, show great promise of eventually being qualified for promotion to the rank of full professor.

The maximum period of probation in full-time service before a decision is made on the promotion of an assistant professor to associate professor (with tenure) is normally six years. In the fifth pre-tenure year, written notice by the TPAC Chair shall be given to the faculty member notifying him/her of promotion/tenure policies and timeliness. This period may be somewhat shorter for those with previous full-time service at other institutions, or for those whose performance is exceptional. The faculty member being reviewed must submit an electronic credential portfolio to the TPAC Chair by April 1st of the year immediately preceding that in which a tenure decision is expected. Electronic portfolios will be secured and available only to TPAC members.

A probationary faculty member may request a formal review for promotion or tenure or both prior to the fifth year of service by January 15th. Any such request must be reviewed by the TPAC and may initiate a formal review. Based on the review of the credential portfolio, the TPAC will determine whether or not to pursue the assistant professor's tenure and promotion case. The decision will be forwarded to the Dean by the TPAC Chair. For the decision to pursue the assistant professor's tenure and promotion case, the TPAC shall assign responsibility to a subcommittee consisting of at least three tenured faculty to review the performance of the faculty member. The review shall cover all relevant areas (see Article IV) for promotion or tenure or both. The faculty member being reviewed will be informed by the TPAC Chair about the makeup of the subcommittee.

If the promotion and tenure are denied, the faculty member will be awarded a terminal one-year appointment. Notice of non-reappointment must be given no later than September 15th of the terminal academic year.

To Professor

The basis for promotion to the rank of professor should be made on one's accomplishment and development since promotion to associate professor, one's reputation outside of the University, and evidence of one's capacity and willingness for continued growth. Since the rank of full professor is a mark of the highest academic distinction, the length of time required for promotion to full professor cannot be specified.

Article VI. Department Procedures

The Role of an Advocate

A faculty member is assigned a mentor upon hiring. The mentor must be a tenured faculty member, preferably from the candidate's discipline. The mentor may serve as the advocate. The advocate shall not be a member of the Executive Committee during the Executive Committee review stage. The role of the advocate includes understanding the candidate's casebook and being able to defend its merits to the Executive Committee. In the event of a negative recommendation at the department level, the candidate may choose to identify him/herself as his/her own advocate or designate another tenured UM-Dearborn faculty member.

P & T Committee Membership

For the decision to pursue the assistant professor's tenure and promotion case, the TPAC shall assign responsibility to a subcommittee consisting of at least three tenured faculty to review the performance of the faculty member.

A team of three professors (associate or full) will review each assistant professor's credential portfolio; a team of three full professors will review each tenured associate professor's credential 11 portfolio. In the event that there are not enough full professors to form a three-member promotion committee, full professor faculty from relevant disciplines may be invited to serve. The three-member promotion subcommittee will submit a written report to the TPAC Chair. (In the event that the TPAC Chair does not hold the rank of full professor, then a member of the full professor subcommittee will be appointed as Chair of TPAC from within the subcommittee group.)

Normally, promotion and tenure decisions involve only one academic unit. However, when a person has been actively involved in more than one unit or when the faculty member's specialty is not available within the DOE, s/he may ask the reviewing group to include an appropriate faculty member outside of the Department in the review subcommittee. Under no circumstances may a majority of the subcommittee be faculty outside of the Department; thus, only one faculty member may be outside of the Department. If necessary, the subcommittee may include faculty from other campuses of the University of Michigan. The inclusion of faculty from other units or other campuses must be approved by the CEHHS Executive Committee.

Timeline for Reviews

The subcommittee shall report its review to the reassembled TPAC no later than November 15th. The TPAC will receive the report and must cast a formal ballot. The TPAC Chair will then forward the recommendation to the Department Chair. The

department chair will receive the TPAC decision, conduct his/her independent review, write a recommendation letter, and forward both recommendations to the CEHHS Executive Committee and the Dean in the form of a letter that meets the University requirements as to time, format, and content. Approval must be by a majority vote.

Voting Procedures

The subcommittee shall report its review to the reassembled TPAC no later than November 15th. The TPAC will receive the report and must cast a formal ballot.

All voting shall be by secret, written ballot, and no one shall discuss how s/he voted.

Following the discussion of evidence regarding teaching, research, and service, an individual vote shall be held for each of the categories of teaching, research and service where faculty shall rate the candidate using the rankings excellent, significantly capable, competent or unacceptable. The ballots on each rating shall be collected by the chair after each vote, but not tabulated until all three category votes have been cast. Once every category has been voted on, the chair and one committee member shall tally the ballots and report the results immediately. The chair is required to inform the dean and CEHHS Executive Committee in writing of the vote counts on each of these three results.

Due to the important nature of promotion and tenure, all committee members should read the materials carefully and be present for the entire discussion. Absentee voting shall be permitted only under the following unusual circumstances:

1. Professional conflict (e.g., attending a conference, a teaching conflict)
2. Family emergency
3. Personal health issue

Absentee ballots must be received prior to the meeting in order to be included in the tally. At all stages of the promotion process, a statement of rationale shall be written for negative recommendations regarding promotion cases rendered. In the case of a negative decision by the department promotion and tenure committee, the TPAC committee shall write the statement of rationale. The candidate shall be provided a copy of the rationale and given an opportunity to include in his/her casebook a rebuttal to such rationale. The casebook along with the rationale shall then move forward. In the case of a negative decision by the Department Chair, the chair shall write a statement of rationale and provide a copy to the candidate. The candidate shall be given an opportunity to include in his/her casebook a rebuttal to such rationale a minimum of two weeks before the next level of review. In the event of a negative recommendation at the department level, the candidate may choose to identify him/herself as his/her own advocate or designate a full professor UM-Dearborn faculty member as the advocate at the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee shall review all materials. In the event of a negative decision, the Executive Committee shall provide a written rationale for its recommendation. The Executive Committee will submit the entire case to the Dean. The Dean shall review all materials. In the event of a negative decision, the Dean shall provide a written rationale for his/her recommendation. The Dean will submit the entire case to the Provost. The Provost shall review all materials.

Independent Review Process for the Chair

The department chair will receive the TPAC decision, conduct his/her independent review, write a recommendation letter, and forward the department recommendation to the CEHHS Executive Committee and the Dean in the form of a letter that meets the University requirements as to time, format, and content.

Notification of Results

All promotion and tenure recommendations are subject to approval by the Board of Regents.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should be given timely notice of departmental recommendations, in writing, by their chair. Because each decision in this process is a recommendation, the chair and others involved should not make public announcements about the results until the entire process has been completed.

Appendix I

Guidelines for Choosing External Reviewers of Faculty Research

In considering faculty candidates for tenure and for promotion to the rank of associate or full professor, many of the nation's most prestigious universities make regular use of external reviewers. That practice is now also standard at all three campuses of the University of Michigan. Each unit shall be responsible for promulgating procedures for selecting a minimum of five external reviewers for each casebook, of which two shall be from a list recommended by the candidate.

A judgment by the promotion and tenure committee to not send a promotion and/or tenure case to external reviewers shall be treated as a negative recommendation and in such instances a statement of rationale shall be written. The candidate shall be provided a copy of the rationale and given the opportunity to include a rebuttal in his/her casebook.

Approved Department of Education Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Each unit shall ensure that the evaluators are not be asked to advise on the tenure/promotion actions, but rather be invited to pass judgment on the published papers and other materials resulting from scholarly activity. Those chosen for this purpose should have the scholarly credentials to enable him/her to offer an objective expert opinion, and in general they ought to come from institutions of high caliber, where research and publication are appropriately esteemed. Ordinarily, they should be scholars whose work is not closely identified with that of the candidate, for example, as a dissertation advisor or as a co-author. It is the responsibility of the candidate to make known any special association or relationship with the evaluator(s).

Each unit shall indicate in its procedures that the evaluations should be regarded as advisory rather than binding, since the final responsibility for assessing research, as well as for assessing teaching and service, remains with promotion and tenure committees and the appropriate administrative officers of the University.

The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
The University of Michigan-Dearborn

Appendix II

Timeline for Progress and Formal Reviews

Dates indicated relate to assistant to associate promotions and associate to full promotions.

A. Progress Review

No later than May 1 Progress review teams and peer reviewers are selected from among the TPAC membership to review assistant/associate professors in the next school year.

Normally, at the beginning of the assistant professor's second and fourth years in service and the associate professor's third year of service;
No later than Oct. 1 TPAC Chair informs the faculty member of the progress review and of the candidate's roles and obligations in the process.

No later than Dec. 1 The assistant professor meets with his/her mentor to discuss the development of his/her portfolio.

No later than Jan. 15 Assistant professors shall have the option to request a review in a year other than the second or fourth years of service for progress to associate professor. Associate professors can make such a request at any time for progress to full professor. The request shall be made by the candidate to the TPAC Chair no later than January 15.

Approved Department of Education Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

2nd Wednesday in February Faculty members being reviewed must submit his/her electronic credential portfolio to the TPAC Chair by the second Wednesday in February.

No later than April 1 A team of two tenured faculty members reviews each assistant/associate professor's credentials and reports to the TPAC.

No later than April 30 TPAC members discuss and approve the report, and the Chair provides the assistant/associate professor with a letter regarding his/her progress toward tenure and promotion. The TPAC Chair forwards the letter to the Dean.

B. Formal Review for Tenure

Normally, at the beginning of the assistant professor's fifth year in service;

No later than Sept. 15 The TPAC Chair informs the faculty member that s/he is eligible for tenure and promotion review.

No later than Oct. 1 The assistant professor meets with his/her mentor to review his/her portfolio and the tenure and promotion process.

No later than Jan. 15 Assistant professors shall have the option to request a review in a year other than the second or fourth years of service for promotion to associate professor. Associate professors can make such a request at any time. The request shall be made by the candidate to the TPAC Chair no later than January 15.

No later than April 1 The faculty member being reviewed must submit his/her electronic credential portfolio to the TPAC Chair.

No later than April 30 TPAC shall meet to review the assistant professor's eligibility for tenure and promotion. Based on the review of the credential portfolio, the TPAC determines whether to pursue the assistant professor's tenure and promotion case. In the case of associate professors, a subcommittee of the full professors will be formed to review the portfolio. The decision will be forwarded to the Dean by the TPAC Chair.

For the decision to pursue the assistant professor's tenure and promotion case or the associate professor's promotion case, the TPAC shall assign responsibility to a subcommittee of appropriate faculty to review the performance of the faculty member for tenure and promotion. The TPAC Chair shall inform the assistant/associate professor about formation of the subcommittee.

No later than September 15 External review letters are due and included in the casebook.

Normally, at the beginning of the assistant professor's sixth year in rank;

Approved Department of Education Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

No later than November 15 The subcommittee shall report the results of the review to the reassembled TPAC. The TPAC must have a formal ballot. The TPAC Chair will forward the recommendation to the Executive Committee for promotion or tenure or both. The Department Chair will write a separate letter of recommendation and forward to the Executive Committee.

No later than Dec. 1 The Executive Committee shall formally vote to accept or reject the recommendation of the TPAC and the Department Chair. The resulting vote, recommendations, and all other relevant documentation shall be forwarded to the Dean.

No later than Dec. 5 The Dean informs the faculty member about the results of the evaluation in relation to tenure and promotion considerations.

First week of January The Dean submits the promotion recommendation to the appropriate campus body.

C. Promotion to Full Professor Review

No later than Jan. 15 Tenured faculty shall have the option to request a review in a specific year for progress or promotion to full professor. The request shall be made by the candidate to the TPAC Chair no later than January 15. The committee of the whole will be composed of Senate-rank, full professors.

No later than April 1 The faculty member being reviewed must submit his/her electronic credential portfolio to the TPAC Chair.

No later than April 30 TPAC shall meet to review the associate professor's eligibility for promotion. In the case of associate professors, a subcommittee of the full professors will be formed to review the portfolio. The decision will be forwarded to the Dean by the TPAC Chair.

For the decision to pursue the associate professor's promotion case, the TPAC shall assign responsibility to a subcommittee of appropriate faculty to review the performance of the faculty member for promotion. The TPAC Chair shall inform the associate professor about formation of the subcommittee.

No later than September 15 External review letters are due and included in the casebook.

No later than November 15 The subcommittee shall report the results of the review to the reassembled TPAC. The TPAC must have a formal ballot. The TPAC Chair will forward the recommendation to the Executive Committee for promotion. The Department Chair will write a separate letter of recommendation and forward to the Executive Committee.

Approved Department of Education Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

No later than Dec. 1 The Executive Committee shall formally vote to accept or reject the recommendation of the TPAC and the Department Chair. The resulting vote, recommendations, and all other relevant documentation shall be forwarded to the Dean.

No later than Dec. 5 The Dean informs the faculty member about the results of the evaluation in relation to promotion considerations.

First week of January The Dean submits the promotion recommendation to the appropriate campus body