

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Approved August 30, 2015 by the DHHS Governing Faculty

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN-DEARBORN DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES GUIDELINES FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY APPOINTMENTS, AWARDING OF TENURE, AND PROMOTION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

I. AUTHORITY. The statements by 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, the document entitled University of Michigan-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Decisions Guidelines per the Provost effective September 9, 2015, and elsewhere in the Regents' Bylaws and Standard Practice Guide are the bases of the following Guidelines for the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) of the University of Michigan-Dearborn (UM-Dearborn).

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

III. CATEGORIES OF APPOINTMENTS AND STATUS. Faculty appointments at UM-Dearborn fall into three categories: tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure track. Professor and associate professor categories are normally tenured appointments. New appointments at these levels with immediate tenure are subject to approval by the Regents, as are awards of tenure to faculty after probationary periods. The ranks of assistant professor and instructor are tenure-track appointments, which are considered probationary. The title of instructor is reserved for persons hired for a tenure-track appointment and who are close to, but have not yet completed all of, the requirements for their terminal degree. Instructors are given a maximum of two one-year appointments at the level of full-time instructor.

IV. APPOINTMENTS: POLICIES AND PROCEDURES. Normally, initial appointments within HHS 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

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

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.

V. ANNUAL, PROGRESS, AND FORMAL REVIEWS AND PROCEDURES WITHIN HHS FOR CONSIDERATION OF PROMOTION AND TENURE.

Mentoring is an informal process within HHS. Assistant professors and instructors are encouraged to engage with both junior and senior faculty both inside and outside of the department regarding professional advice. A mentor may serve as a guide about the profession and its culture, as a teaching resource, as a research advisor, and/or as a role model.

The HHS conducts three different but interrelated reviews for the consideration of promotion and tenure: (1) annual review, (2) one progress review during the third year, and (3) formal review for tenure decision. Please see Appendix Two for the specific timeline.

In this guideline document and especially in the following paragraphs discussing review for promotion and tenure at both the Assistant to Associate level and the Associate to Full level, the Executive Committee and its role are discussed. When the Executive Committee is referenced, HHS is specifically referring to a reconstituted Executive Committee that contains equal HHS representation *chosen by HHS* through a vote of the governing faculty of the department. Equal representation of HHS refers to faculty members from across the campus who the HHS governing faculty members have determined have academic expertise in health, human services or both.

For both Progress and Formal Tenure review, a P&T committee and P&T Chair will be identified by the Department Chair. For the Formal Tenure review, composition of the P&T may entail members of the department, college, and university, as described below.

A faculty member's portfolio may be assembled in an electronic format for review.

A. Annual Review. At the end of each academic year, every full-time probationary HHS 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

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

promotion and tenure. Following this review, the Chair shall meet with each probationary faculty member and, if requested by the faculty member, a mentor to discuss the annual review.

B. Progress Review. Progress reviews are normally conducted in the non-tenured faculty's third year of service.

A select body of tenured faculty members identified from the campus at large who have demonstrated an academic interest related to health and human services, constituting themselves as a subset of the P&T committee, 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 credential portfolio to the P&T Chair by the second Wednesday in February. All credentials submitted for review will be maintained in a secure location.

A subcommittee of two tenured faculty members will review each probationary faculty's credentials and report to the P&T committee. The P&T committee will discuss and approve the report. In the case of a positive review, the P&T 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.

In the progress review, the P&T committee may determine that the faculty member has made insufficient progress and thus recommend termination. In such cases, the P&T committee will prepare a letter summarizing the basis for the negative judgment and recommendation, and the Department Chair will transmit the letter to the Dean. In addition to the P&T Committee 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 regarding the negative judgment and/or the termination recommendation. The Dean will consider all documentation and supplemental materials to make the final decision.

C. Formal Review for Tenure Decision. Normally, in the assistant professor's fifth year of service, the P&T Committee will review his/her credentials to determine the eligibility for tenure and promotion in the sixth year, unless otherwise agreed upon in the faculty member's initial hiring contract. The faculty member being reviewed must submit a credential portfolio to the P&T Committee Chair by April 1st of the year immediately

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

preceding that in which a tenure decision is expected. The portfolio will be maintained in a secure location. Electronic portfolios will be secured and available only to P&T committee members. A probationary faculty member may consider promotion or tenure or both prior to the fifth year of service by January 15th. In this case, the faculty member should consult with the Chair of the Department informally. The decision to pursue promotion, tenure or both resides with the faculty member, however the Chair will advise the faculty member.

The Chair in consultation with the faculty member will select an advocate for the faculty member under review and can be selected from the entire tenured faculty body of the University of Michigan Dearborn, including willing and applicable retired or emeritus faculty. 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 electronic portfolio 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.

HHS faculty often have promotion and tenure decisions that involve more than one academic unit. When a faculty member has been actively involved in more than one unit or when the faculty member's specialty is not available within the HHS or even CEHHS, s/he has the right to expect a representative committee that contains members from outside of the Department in the review subcommittee. There may even be times when a majority of the subcommittee are faculty outside of the Department; however, at least one faculty member must be from the Department (preferably) or the College. 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 governing faculty of HHS.

The subcommittee shall report its review to the reassembled P&T committee no later than November 15th. The P&T committee will receive the report and must cast a formal ballot. The P&T committee Chair will then forward the recommendation to the Chair of the Department. The Chair of the Department will receive the P&T committee's decision, conduct his/her independent review, write a recommendation letter, and forward department recommendation to the Executive Committee and the CEHHS Dean in the form of a letter that meets the University requirements as to time, format, and content. An HHS faculty member who serves on the Executive Committee is prohibited from participating on a promotion and/or tenure case at the department-level, however they must recuse themselves from the EC voting process if they choose to vote in the department level process. Approval by the Executive Committee must be by a majority vote.

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

In the event of a negative recommendation rendered by the Executive Committee, the recommendation shall be forwarded to the Dean in the form of a letter. The candidate shall be provided a copy of the recommendation along with a rationale and given the opportunity to include a rebuttal in his/her portfolio. Following the recommendation made by the Executive Committee, the Dean will conduct an independent review and shall write a letter of recommendation. In the event of a negative recommendation rendered by the Dean, the candidate shall be provided a copy of the recommendation along with a rationale and given the opportunity to include a rebuttal in his/her portfolio. If the Dean and Executive Committee both render positive endorsements of a promotion and/or tenure case, then only a letter of recommendation from the Dean shall be required.

D. Promotion to Full Professor Progress Review. Progress reviews of a tenured associate professor are optional, but may begin in the third year following promotion to associate professor and continue in three-year cycles until promoted to full professor if elected by the faculty member. Tenured associate professors, at any time after the third year in the rank of associate professor but prior to promotion to full professor, may request a review of the credential portfolio. No observations of teaching are 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 can make the decision to require classroom observations. A subcommittee will be comprised of two full professors. The request shall be made by the candidate to the P&T committee Chair no later than January 15th. The subcommittee will submit a written report to the P&T committee Chair. The P&T committee 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.

E. Promotion to Full Professor Review. The request shall be made by the candidate to the P&T committee Chair no later than January 15th. The subcommittee of the whole will be composed of three full professors. In the event that there are not enough full professors to form a three-member promotion subcommittee, full professor faculty from relevant disciplines in other units will be invited to serve. Similarly, the Executive Committee will also be reconstituted to include only full professors for promotion to full professor reviews. The Executive Committee will need to invite appropriate full professor faculty if there are not at least four full professors in the Department.

During any progress review, a P&T subcommittee consisting of full professors may determine that the faculty member has made sufficient progress to be considered for promotion to full professor. The tenured associate professor will be required to submit a credential portfolio for

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

consideration and promotion to full professor. A quorum of tenured faculty members who hold full professor rank, constituting themselves as a subcommittee of the whole P&T committee, shall meet no later than April 30th to review the tenured associate professor's credential portfolio toward promotion to full professor. The faculty member being reviewed must submit his/her credential portfolio to the P&T Chair by April 1st. All credentials submitted for review will be maintained in a secure location.

A team of three full professors will review each tenured associate professor's credential portfolio. In the event that there are not enough full professors to form a three-member promotion committee, full professor faculty from relevant disciplines will be invited to serve. Further, when a faculty member has been actively involved in more than one unit or when the faculty member's specialty is not available within the HHS or even CEHHS, s/he has the right to expect a representative committee that contains members from outside of the Department in the review subcommittee. There may even be times when a majority of the subcommittee are faculty outside of the Department; however, at least one faculty member must be from the Department (preferably) or the College. 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 governing faculty of HHS.

Similarly, the Executive Committee will also be reconstituted to include only full professors for promotion to full professor credential portfolio reviews. The three-member promotion subcommittee will submit a written report to the P&T Chair. (In the event that the P&T Chair does not hold the rank of full professor, then a member of the full professor subcommittee will be appointed as Chair of the P&T committee from within the subcommittee group.) The P&T committee Chair will provide the faculty member with a letter regarding his/her progress toward promotion to full professor. The letter will be forwarded to the Dean. In the event of a negative review the P&T subcommittee shall provide a written rationale for its recommendation.

In the event of a positive review by the P&T committee, the portfolio with external review letters will move to the Department Chair, Executive Committee, and the Dean.

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. The candidate shall be given an opportunity to provide a written response to the Department's rationale. Both documents shall be forwarded to the unit's Executive Committee for consideration. 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

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

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

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 chair of such committee shall write the statement of rationale. In the case of a negative decision by the college's Executive Committee, the committee members will collectively write the statement of rationale. The candidate shall be provided a copy of the rationale and given an opportunity to include in his/her portfolio a rebuttal to such rationale. The portfolio along with the rationale shall then move forward.

VI. AREAS OF EVALUATION. We seek faculty 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 department, college, campus, profession, and metropolitan region. For promotion to Professor with tenure, continued high-quality teaching and research, leadership in scholarly activities, and service to the department, college, campus, profession, and metropolitan region 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 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:

A. 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

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

tenure in the HHS 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 HHS'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 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
- Coordination of service learning activities
- Implementing new teaching technologies and practices

REQUIRED evidence for evaluating teaching performance includes:

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 HHS student evaluation forms or other campus forms that are used in support of student evaluation. 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 sample 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 various courses and an explanation of their teaching methods. These and other materials should be incorporated into a teaching portfolio.

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

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 faculty member. The reviewers will be selected in consultation with the Chair of the Department. The reviewers will submit a written report to the candidate and the Chair of the Department, and this report should be included in the teaching portfolio.

B. Research. An effective faculty member will engage in research that advances scholarship in their fields of study, and potentially has implications for application in policy or practice. 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 during Formal Review. 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. Collaboration with one's colleagues is valued, and 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.

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(s) 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.

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

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.

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. If the faculty

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

member is given release time at the Dean's discretion his/her performance in this area should be evaluated according to whether it goes beyond the minimal assigned duties for which the release time is granted.

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
 - 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

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

C. Service. An additional qualification for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure in the HHS 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 department, college, campus, profession, and metropolitan region. 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."

Faculty engagement in professional activities outside the specific fields of instruction and scholarship are considered "service" and each faculty member is to be evaluated on his/her performance in this area too. Additionally, service might 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 local professional or community-based organization
- Providing instruction such as workshops or lectures to the profession or the community
- Serving as a consultant or expert witness

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

- 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 the department, college, campus, profession, and metropolitan region. 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.

VII. COMBINED QUALIFICATIONS NECESSARY FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE. The three areas of a faculty member's activities discussed above must be central to any evaluation whether Annual, Progress, or Full Review 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.

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Promotions in the HHS require certain levels of performance in the three categories discussed in Section VI. A positive recommendation for promotion/tenure requires that the faculty member must be judged (1) excellent in either teaching or research, (2) at least significantly capable in either teaching or research, and (3) at least competent in service.

A. Promotion 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 P&T 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. 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.

B. Promotion to Full 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 scholarly 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.

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

VIII. COLLEGE-LEVEL PROCEDURES. Following campus guidelines each unit shall be responsible for promulgating procedures for reviewing assistant professors under consideration for re-appointment annually through year five beginning with their hire year, including third-year Progress Reviews. The Annual and third-year Review letters must include information regarding the candidate's progress toward tenure in the areas of teaching, research, and service and, if necessary, provide recommendations to help the candidate

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

address areas of concern. The procedures created by the unit must adhere to the automatic review process for non-reappointment decisions stipulated below:

In the event of an issuance of Notice of Non-Reappointment, the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall provide a written rationale for its recommendation. The candidate shall be given an opportunity to provide a written response to the Department's rationale. Both documents shall be forwarded to the unit's Executive Committee for consideration. The Executive Committee shall consider the merits of the rationale along with the candidate's written response in order to make a recommendation to the Dean who shall render a final decision.

In the case of promotion or tenure after the P&T Committee has forwarded its recommendations regarding promotion or tenure or both (point V), the Executive Committee shall formally vote to accept or reject the recommendations. Voting by the Executive Committee shall be by written ballot, and no one shall discuss the final vote or how s/he voted. The written ballot shall include the reasons for voting yes or no. The resulting vote, recommendations and all other relevant papers (including offprints, books, etc.) shall be forwarded to the Dean, who shall forward these materials to the appropriate campus body.

The faculty member shall be informed in writing of the results of the evaluation in relation to promotion considerations. S/He should be given timely notice of decisions by the Dean, so that s/he may prepare a rebuttal to the decision to be included in his/her portfolio if s/he believes improper procedures were followed, s/he has been discriminated against, his/her academic freedom has been violated, or his/her treatment has been unfair. Since this is only one step in a long process, which would later be overturned, the Dean and others involved should not make public announcements about the results until the process is completed.

It is, of course, understood that all "decisions" are simply recommendations to higher levels in the promotion/tenure chain, which goes through the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, the Chancellor, the President, and the Board of Regents.

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 portfolio, of which two shall be from a list recommended by the candidate. 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." Thus, the external review committee may be composed of experts representing multiple disciplines related to health and human services.

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 portfolio.

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[1]

No later than May 1

Progress review teams and peer reviewers are selected from among the P&T Committee membership to review assistant/associate professors in the next school year.

Normally, at the beginning of the assistant professor's third year of service and the associate professor's third year of service;

No later than Oct. 1

P&T 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 Chair and/or mentors 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 third year 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 P&T Chair no later than January 15.

2nd Wednesday in February

Faculty members being reviewed must submit his/her credential portfolio to the P&T 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 P&T Committee.

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

No later than April 30

P&T Committee 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 P&T 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 P&T 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 Chair and/or mentors 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 fifth? year 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 P&T Chair no later than January 15.

No later than April 1

The faculty member being reviewed must submit his/her credential portfolio to the P&T Chair.

No later than April 30

The P&T Committee shall meet to review the assistant professor's eligibility for tenure and promotion. Based on the review of the credential portfolio, the P&T Committee determines whether to pursue the assistant professor's tenure and promotion case. In the case of

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

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 P&T Chair.

For the decision to pursue the assistant professor's tenure and promotion case or the associate professor's promotion case, the P&T Committee shall assign responsibility to a subcommittee of appropriate faculty to review the performance of the faculty member for tenure and promotion. The P&T 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;

No later than November 15

The subcommittee shall report the results of the review to the reassembled P&T Committee. The P&T Committee must have a formal ballot. The P&T 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 it to the Executive Committee.

No later than Dec. 1

The Executive Committee shall formally vote to accept or reject the recommendation of the P&T Committee 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.

Approved Health and Human Services Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

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 P&T Chair no later than January 15. The committee of the whole will be composed of Senate-rank, full professors.

[1] (Assistant: third years; Associate: every three years; also applies to the exceptional cases of instructors with tenure-track appointments.)