

**Guidelines for Faculty Appointments,
Evaluations, Contract Renewals, Awarding of
Tenure, and Promotion Standards and
Procedures**

**UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN-DEARBORN
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS**

**Approved by COB Governing Faculty
January 24, 2025**

Contents

SECTION 1: AUTHORITY	1
A. AUTHORITY TO DETERMINE FACULTY STATUS	1
B. INFORMATION USED TO DETERMINE FACULTY STATUS	1
SECTION 2: DEFINITIONS	1
SECTION 3: SCOPE	2
SECTION 4: APPOINTMENTS	2
A. CATEGORIES OF APPOINTMENTS COVERED BY THE GUIDELINES	3
B. SEARCH COMMITTEE PROCESS AND PROCEDURES	3
1. Formation of Search Committee	3
2. Information Provided to Professorial Staff	3
3. Faculty Feedback and Recommendation of the Search Committee.....	3
4. Qualifications of Job Candidates Brought to Campus	3
5. Joint Appointments between Departments at College of Business.....	3
6. Joint Appointments between College of Business and other Units at University of Michigan- Dearborn	4
C. TERMS OF APPOINTMENTS	4
1. Assistant Professor	4
2. (Full) Professor and Associate Professor	4
SECTION 5: REVIEWS AND REAPPOINTMENTS	4
A. MERIT DOCUMENT	4
B. DEPARTMENT REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE (RPT) COMMITTEE.....	5
C. REVIEWS.....	5
1. Assistant Professor	5
2. Associate Professor and (Full) Professors with Probationary Status	8
3. Associate Professor with Tenure.....	8
4. Full Professor with Tenure.....	8
SECTION 6: PROMOTION AND TENURE	9
A. TEACHER-SCHOLAR MODEL	9
B. STANDARD.....	9
1. Teaching.....	10

2. Research.....	10
3. Service.....	10
4. Discrete Evaluation.....	11
C. TENURE PROBATIONARY PERIOD (“TENURE CLOCK”).....	11
D. REPRESENTATIVE	11
1. Selection of a Representative.....	11
2. Task of the Representative.....	12
E. PROCEDURES.....	12
1. General Information Regarding Vote	12
2. Initiation of Process	13
3. External Evaluation of Research.....	13
4. Department Level Process	13
5. College Level Process.....	15
6. Promotion and/or Tenure Process Timetable.....	16
SECTION 7: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND REVIEW OF LEO FACULTY	17
A. ANNUAL REPORT GUIDELINES AND SPECIFICATIONS – ALL LECTURERS	17
B. INTERIM REVIEW – LECTURERS I AND III	18
C. MAJOR REVIEW – LECTURERS I-IV	18
D. CONTINUING REVIEW – LECTURERS II AND IV	19
E. ADJUNCT AND INTERMITTENT LECTURER REVIEWS.....	19
SECTION 8: DISMISSALS	20
APPENDIX A – REVIEW DOCUMENTATION	21
1. Teaching.....	21
2. Research.....	22
3. Service.....	23

SECTION 1: AUTHORITY

A. AUTHORITY TO DETERMINE FACULTY STATUS

The Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional and Academic Unit Governance at the University of Michigan, state:

“Considerations of faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes matters relating to academic titles, appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the recommending of tenure and dismissal. Policies and procedures shall be developed for the implementation of these faculty responsibilities.”

B. INFORMATION USED TO DETERMINE FACULTY STATUS

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 and elsewhere in the Regents’ Bylaws are the basis of this document. Other sources have also been utilized, including statements from the University of Michigan-Dearborn Academic Affairs Advisory Council, the University of Michigan-Dearborn Campus Bylaws, and UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures, and the College of Business Bylaws. Nothing in this document shall contradict or supersede other statements with higher authority.

SECTION 2: DEFINITIONS

Applicant: The faculty member seeking reappointment, promotion and/or tenure.

College RPT Committee: Refers to the College Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee of the College of Business, constituted as defined in the College of Business Bylaws.

Conflict of Interest: Before a faculty/administrator is involved in/participates in the applicant’s review at any level (including search, appointment, contract renewals, promotion and tenure, and dismissals and demotions), potential for any conflict of interest should be carefully examined. Some examples of conflict of interest include an amorous/spousal/familial relationship with an applicant. If a review committee deems that a conflict of interest exists, the faculty member or administrator involved shall not participate in the applicant’s review at any level. A dissertation mentor of an applicant shall not serve in a voting capacity at any level either but may submit a written statement which would be treated as an external review.¹

Department RPT Committee: Refers to the Department Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee of the Applicant’s Department in the College of Business, constituted as defined *for that applicant* in Section 5(B) of this document.

Discipline: Refers to the primary teaching and/or research area of focus for the Applicant. The College of Business currently classifies faculty into one of the following six disciplines:

1. Accounting, Taxation, and Legal Studies

¹ This definition for ‘Conflict of Interest’ is applicable for search, appointment, contract renewals, promotion and tenure, and dismissal and demotion review situations (Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8).

2. Finance, Business Economics, and International Business
3. Decision Sciences and Operations Management
4. Information Systems Management
5. Marketing; and
6. Business Administration, Entrepreneurship, Organizational Behavior/Human Resources Management, and Strategic Management.

Eligible Faculty: At all levels, only tenured members of the Governing Faculty may participate in discussions and decisions affecting promotion and/or the awarding of tenure. Furthermore, only Associate Professors and Professors may be involved in actions affecting Assistant Professors, and only Professors may be involved in actions affecting tenured Associate Professors and probationary Professors. Both tenured Professors and tenured Associate Professors are to be involved in evaluating non-tenured Associate Professors. Under no circumstances may one be present when her/his reappointment, promotion and/or tenure are being considered by any evaluation committee.

Executive Committee refers to the Executive Committee of the College of Business.

Faculty refers to members of the teaching and research staff.

Governing Faculty refers to the Governing Faculty of the College of Business with voting rights as that term is defined in the College of Business Bylaws.

Guidelines refer to this document which covers the appointment, promotion, tenure and dismissal of the Professorial Staff.

LEO Faculty are lecturers whose status is covered by the current Agreement between the Regents of the University of Michigan and the University of Michigan Lecturer's Organization.

Probationary Period refers to the period described in Section 6C of these Guidelines.

Probationary Status refers to faculty who meet the conditions described in Section 6C of these Guidelines.

Professorial Staff shall include Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors.

SECTION 3: SCOPE

The Guidelines have been developed to inform and guide the Professorial Staff, their elected or appointed Professorial Staff representatives, and College of Business administrators in their interpretation and implementation of standards and procedures governing appointments (tenured or tenure track), evaluations, and promotions of the Professorial Staff and the awarding of tenure to the Professorial Staff.

This document specifically excludes the appointment, evaluation, and promotion of lecturers whose status is covered by the current Agreement between the Regents of the University of Michigan and the University of Michigan Lecturer's Employee Organization (LEO).

SECTION 4: APPOINTMENTS

A. CATEGORIES OF APPOINTMENTS COVERED BY THE GUIDELINES

These guidelines cover tenure and tenure-track appointments to the Professorial Staff.

B. SEARCH COMMITTEE PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

1. Formation of Search Committee

Professorial Staff Search Committees shall be approved by the Executive Committee.

2. Information Provided to Professorial Staff

For each candidate scheduled to visit campus, the Search Committee shall distribute electronically to all Professorial Staff each candidate's interview schedule, vita, and sample research if available prior to the candidate's visit.

3. Faculty Feedback and Recommendation of the Search Committee

The Search Committee shall distribute a questionnaire (paper or electronic) to all professorial faculty following the candidate's visit and prior to making a recommendation. This questionnaire shall ask for ratings of the candidate's past research, current research, future research potential, teaching potential, and service potential; general feedback regarding the candidate; and an overall rating of the candidate. The questionnaire will allow faculty to indicate the bases of their ratings and comments - interview, meal, CV, and/or research presentation.

The Search Committee shall use the ratings and comments from the returned questionnaires during its deliberations, and all numerical summaries and written comments shall be included in the final recommendation to the Department Chair and Dean.

4. Qualifications of Job Candidates Brought to Campus

A job candidate can be invited for campus visit only if they are deemed Scholarly Academic or Practice Academic in accordance with COB's criteria for these qualifications (with the exception of A.B.D.s). If, in the judgment of the Dean, there is reasonable possibility a job candidate for a Professorial rank will be neither Scholarly Academic or Practice Academic on the date employment is to commence, any contract offered to the job candidate will include a provision that the contract becomes void if the candidate does not meet the criteria for Scholarly Academic or Practice Academic on the date employment is to commence.

5. Joint Appointments between Departments at College of Business

In case of joint appointments, the processes and procedures outlined above will be followed. However, the Search Committee and the faculty involvement will be from both departments. The search process will be handled by the Chair from the department in which the majority of the faculty member's teaching is done. An agreement will be made as to which department will handle future Promotion and Tenure decisions.

6. Joint Appointments between College of Business and other Units at University of Michigan-Dearborn

In case of joint appointments between College of Business and other units, the same process will be followed as with joint appointments within the College of Business. At the time of appointment, an agreement will be made as to how future Promotion and Tenure decisions will be handled.

C. TERMS OF APPOINTMENTS

1. Assistant Professor

The rank of Assistant Professor is a tenure-track appointment. Assistant Professors shall be initially appointed for terms of up to three years. At the end of the contract period, the Assistant Professor shall be evaluated, and if the evaluation is positive, they shall be reappointed for up to three additional years. However, if the evaluation is negative, a one-year terminal contract shall typically be offered. Whenever the term of appointment is not specified, it shall be for one year only.²

Appointment to Assistant Professor is considered probationary until the awarding of promotion and tenure. The terms of the probationary period shall be specified in the letter of appointment. This letter is prepared and sent by the Dean, after consultation with the Department Chair.

Decisions related to credit for previous post-doctoral college-level teaching experience are made by the Dean, based on negotiations between the appointee and the Department Chair, and between the Chair and the Dean.

Decisions about credit for previous post-doctoral, college-level teaching experience must be documented in the letter of appointment and made part of the personnel record. In such cases, the Dean's office must submit documentation of the decision about credit for previous experience with the Assistant Professor's application for promotion and tenure.

2. (Full) Professor and Associate Professor

New appointments at ranks of (Full) Professor and Associate Professor are normally non-tenured appointments. Until tenure is awarded, these appointments are considered probationary. The terms of the probationary period shall be specified in the letter of appointment. This letter is prepared and sent by the Dean, after consultation with the Department Chair.

In the rare instance that a recommendation by the College of Business that a new appointment at these levels is made with immediate tenure, approval of the Regents must be obtained before the offer of appointment is finalized.

SECTION 5: REVIEWS AND REAPPOINTMENTS

A. MERIT DOCUMENT

Once appointed, every College of Business Professorial Staff member is required annually to complete the College's merit form on her/his professional activities during the past academic year.

² [The Bylaws of the University of Michigan Board of Regents](#), Section 5.08(2)

B. DEPARTMENT REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE (RPT) COMMITTEE

For reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions involving Assistant Professors, the Department RPT Committee *for an applicant* would consist of all tenured discipline faculty (n) plus n+1 randomly selected tenured department faculty. Specifically,

- a) There is no required composition of Associate versus Full faculty.
- b) This committee will have a minimum size of 7 faculty.
- c) If n (the number of tenured discipline faculty) is less than three (3), then the number (3-n) will be selected by the Department Chair from close/related disciplines before the four (4) non-discipline tenured department faculty are randomly selected to constitute the committee of seven (7).
- d) If n+1 non-discipline tenured faculty cannot be fulfilled from the department, any additional tenured faculty needed would be randomly selected from other COB departments.
- e) Should a selected member be unable/unwilling to serve on the committee, the department chair will randomly select a replacement member.
- f) For all random selections, the name(s) will be drawn from the list of all eligible faculty by a staff member in the presence of at least two tenured faculty.
- g) For reappointments, the n+1 members will be selected by September 30 in the calendar year prior to the committee meeting (which typically occurs in March).
- h) For promotion and tenure, the n+1 members will be chosen by May 1 in the calendar year of the committee meeting (which typically occurs in October or November).
- i) If there are multiple candidates from the same discipline in the same year for reappointment or for promotion and tenure (such that the n discipline faculty would be identical), the Department RPT Committee will be the same for all these candidates.
- j) The Department Chair shall chair the Department RPT Committee, *ex officio*.

For promotion (and tenure, if applicable) decisions involving Associate Professors, the Department RPT Committee would consist of all tenured Full Professors in the Applicant's department. Further,

- a) If there are no tenured Full Professors in the Applicant's department, the case will move directly to the next stage of the process.
- b) The Department Chair shall chair the Department RPT Committee, *ex officio*, provided s/he is a Full Professor. If not, the committee will select a Chair from within its membership.

C. REVIEWS

All Professorial Staff will be reviewed as provided below.

1. Assistant Professor

Each Assistant Professor must be reviewed annually by her/his Department Chair and at minimum every three years by both her/his Department RPT Committee and the College RPT Committee. The purpose of these reviews is to (a) document the Assistant Professor's qualifications for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, (b) ensure the Assistant Professor remains classified as Scholarly Academic or Practice Academic as defined by the College of Business, and (c) ensure the Assistant Professor remains a Participating faculty member as defined by the College of Business. In all Assistant Professor reviews (annual and periodic) and

in all recommendations related to reappointment, each Assistant Professor must be evaluated in three areas, which are defined in accordance with the University of Michigan Faculty Handbook. The three areas are: teaching, research, and service. There are no specific expectations defined for any of these areas. However, each Assistant Professor must reach a level of performance indicating s/he is making satisfactory progress toward the goal of promotion and tenure.

The University of Michigan-Dearborn and the College of Business endorse the teacher/scholar model. This model emphasizes a commitment to excellence in both teaching and research. Thus the foci for the Assistant Professor should be on developing teaching and research excellence. Service, however, should not be neglected as it is valued and expected.

a) *Annual Review*

On an annual basis, the Assistant Professor and the Department Chair shall have a formal review meeting of the previous academic year no later than September 30. The purpose of the annual review is to evaluate the Assistant Professor's performance in all relevant areas (teaching, research, and service), indicate whether s/he is making progress toward promotion and/or tenure, and provide written feedback as to the performance.

b) *Periodic Review/Reappointment*

The purpose of the periodic review is to evaluate the Assistant Professor's progress toward the goal of promotion and tenure. If the conclusion is reached that the Assistant Professor is making satisfactory progress toward this goal, the ultimate outcome of the periodic review may lead to a favorable decision as to the Assistant Professor's reappointment. This may be a less exhaustive review than the promotion and tenure review. While the decision to reappoint or not reappoint non-tenured members of the Professorial Staff is made by the Dean, the decision shall be based on reviews that include formal faculty involvement, rather than being based solely on the individual determinations of the Department Chair and Dean.³ Therefore, the Dean's recommendation shall take into consideration the Assistant Professor's Review Documentation (as defined in Appendix A), the Department Chair's recommendation as to reappointment, the Department RPT Committee's recommendation as to reappointment, and the College RPT Committee's recommendation as to reappointment.

Recommendations from the Department RPT Committee and the College RPT Committee shall include a listing of the number of votes cast for each of the following three options – Making satisfactory progress, Making satisfactory progress with concerns, Not making satisfactory progress – with regards to teaching, research, service (each is a separate vote). Votes on teaching, research, and service will be revealed once all voting for all three categories is complete. The recommendation shall also include a count of an overall vote for reappointment (yes/no).

c) *Representative for Periodic Review*

- (1) Selection of a Representative: For purposes of the periodic review, the Chair shall select a Representative (referred to as Advocate in the UM-Dearborn P&T Procedures) for the Assistant Professor to be reviewed. The selection shall be in consultation with and acceptable to the Assistant Professor. The Representative shall typically be a faculty member who is familiar with the Assistant Professor's work. However, if there are no such faculty members available or willing to serve as Representative, the Representative shall be the senior tenured faculty member in the

³ [The University of Michigan Standard Practice Guide 201.13](#)

Assistant Professor's discipline (or in the department if there are no tenured faculty members in that discipline). If the Assistant Professor so desires, s/he can choose to act as her/his own Representative for presenting the Review Documentation to the RPT Committees. However, s/he shall not be present during the actual deliberations of the RPT Committees.

- (2) Task of the Representative: In cases other than where the Assistant Professor is acting as her/his own Representative, the Representative will discuss the record with the Assistant Professor and familiarize her/himself with the Assistant Professor's teaching, research, and service record so that s/he can present the Assistant Professor's case throughout the review process. That is, the Representative presents the case and answers questions at both the Department RPT Committee and the College RPT Committee meetings. However, the Representative stays in the room and participates in the deliberations only if s/he is also a member of that RPT Committee. The Representative must not reveal to the Assistant Professor confidential information such as deliberations of the RPT Committees.

d) *Positive Recommendation for Reappointment*

A committee's recommendation will be considered positive for reappointment if a majority of committee members (excluding the Department Chair and/or Dean) participating (present or remotely) in the meeting vote in favor of reappointment.

e) *Periodic Review/Reappointment Timetable*

The following is only a suggested timetable for the periodic review/reappointment process. Failure to follow this timetable shall not rise to a right to appeal a negative decision to reappoint.

- (1) The periodic review process shall occur during the academic year (Review Year) in which the Assistant Professor's contract is set to expire.
- (2) The Review Documentation shall be submitted to the appropriate Department Chair no later than February 1 of the Review Year.
- (3) On receipt of the Review Documentation, the Department Chair shall provide access to this material to all tenured faculty of the Department and request them to provide feedback if they so choose to the Department RPT Committee.
- (4) The Department RPT Committee shall hold a meeting sometime no later than the first half of March with the purpose of making a recommendation regarding the Assistant Professor's reappointment. A brief written narrative relating to each of the areas of teaching, research, and service that describes the Department RPT Committee's key deliberations in these areas shall be prepared by the Representative (or by a designated Department RPT Committee member if the Representative is not a member of the committee) and shared with the Department RPT Committee within three business days of the committee meeting. In case of any disagreement about the written narrative, the Department RPT Committee shall vote on the narratives related to each of the areas of teaching, research, and service. This narrative shall be submitted to the Dean's office together with the Department RPT Committee's voting outcome as to reappointment, within seven business days of the committee meeting. This same information shall be concurrently shared with the Assistant

Professor. The Assistant Professor can submit a written response to the above within five business days to the Dean's Office, if s/he wishes to do so.

- (5) The Department Chair shall make a separate recommendation as to reappointment within seven business days of the Department RPT Committee meeting. The Department Chair shall forward to the Dean's office the Review Documentation and the Department Chair's recommendation, which shall include a narrative. The Chair's recommendation shall be shared concurrently with the Assistant Professor. The Assistant Professor can submit a written response to the recommendation within five business days to the Dean's Office, if s/he wishes to do so.
- (6) The College RPT Committee shall hold a meeting sometime no later than the first half of April for the purpose of making a recommendation to the Dean as to reappointment. The College RPT Committee's recommendation shall be based on the Review Documentation, the Department RPT Committee's narrative and voting outcome, the Department Chair's recommendation, and the Assistant Professor's written responses, if any. The College RPT Committee shall forward to the Dean's office the committee's recommendation, which shall include a narrative. The College RPT Committee's recommendation shall be shared concurrently with the Assistant Professor. The Assistant Professor can submit a written response to the recommendation within five business days to the Dean's Office, if s/he wishes to do so.
- (7) The Dean shall make the final determination as to reappointment. The Dean's recommendation shall take into consideration the Review Documentation, the Department RPT Committee's narrative and voting outcome, the Department Chair's recommendation, and the College RPT Committee's recommendation. The Dean shall typically notify the Assistant Professor of her/his recommendation by the end of April.

2. Associate Professor and (Full) Professors with Probationary Status

The process as described in Section 5.B.1 for reviewing Assistant Professors shall be the process used to review Associate Professors and (Full) Professors with Probationary Status.

3. Associate Professor with Tenure

Each Associate Professor shall be reviewed annually by her/his Department Chair. The purpose of this review is to ensure the Associate Professor remains (a) classified as Scholarly Academic or Practice Academic as defined by the College of Business and (b) a Participating faculty member as defined by the College of Business. If requested by the Associate Professor, the Department Chair shall set up a meeting(s) with an appropriate group of Professors to provide guidance to the Associate Professor as to what s/he needs to do to meet the requirements for promotion. All reviews are evaluative only and there will be no consideration of possible termination based on the results of the review.

4. Full Professor with Tenure

Each Professor shall be reviewed annually by his/her Department Chair. The purpose of this review is to ensure the Professor remains (a) classified as Scholarly Academic or Practice Academic as defined by the College of Business and (b) a Participating faculty member as defined by the College of Business. If requested by the Professor, the Department Chair shall set up a meeting(s) with an appropriate group of Professors to provide guidance to the Professor as to what s/he needs to do to meet the requirements for continuing active teaching and research

productivity. All reviews are evaluative only and there will be no consideration of possible termination based on the results of the review.

SECTION 6: PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. TEACHER-SCHOLAR MODEL

The University of Michigan-Dearborn and the College of Business endorse the Teacher-Scholar Model rather than the Research-Scholar Model. The College of Business seeks faculty who value and are committed to excellence in both teaching and research. The faculty of the College of Business believes the two are inextricably linked and that on-going research contributes to the intellectual vitality characteristic of quality classroom instruction. The foci of evaluation for Assistant Professor's will thus be on effectiveness in teaching and research performance; however, service should not be neglected. For promotion to Full Professor with tenure continued high-quality in both teaching and research is expected and is in keeping the Teacher-Scholar Model.⁴

B. STANDARD

Promotions from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor normally include tenure, and they must therefore be regarded as critical for both the institution and the individual. Recommendations for such promotions must be based on demonstrated and acceptable levels of performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

Promotion to the rank of Professor should be made on the basis of development demonstrated since promotion to Associate Professor. The Applicant's scholarly activities will be judged by refereed publications beyond that expected for promotion to Associate. Evaluation of quality of publications and their impact plays an important role in the decision. Although collaboration is appreciated and desired, the College of Business also expects Applicants recommended for promotion with tenure to the rank of Professor to be independent in and take lead in her/his research activities. Since the rank of Professor is a mark of the highest academic distinction, the above assessments are necessary, but may not be sufficient for promotion.

No recommendation for promotion or award of tenure is automatic, nor does it depend simply on length of service in general, or length of service in the various ranks. The University of Michigan-Dearborn and the College of Business considers teaching, research, and service in all tenure and promotion decisions. There is no single defined expectation in any area but Applicants must meet minimal standards in all three areas. Some qualified Applicants will be stronger, for example, in research or in teaching.⁵ The faculty member may find it helpful to obtain guidance from more senior faculty and others involved in their evaluation concerning what s/he needs to do to meet the performance requirements.

Four terms of the evaluation are considered standard and are to be used in official documents recommending promotion and/or tenure: (1) excellent, (2) significantly capable, (3) competent, and (4) unacceptable. Promotion or tenure requires certain levels of performance in the various categories, as follows: The minimum requirements are that the faculty member (1) must be

⁴ [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#), Article II – Campus-Wide Promotion and Tenure Procedures

⁵ [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#), Article II – Campus-Wide Promotion and Tenure Procedures

considered excellent in either teaching or research; (2) must give evidence of being at least significantly capable in teaching and research; and (3) must be judged at least competent in service. Positive evidence must be provided in every category; in the absence of evidence, competence may not be merely assumed.

1. Teaching

The University of Michigan-Dearborn and the College of Business take pride in quality teaching. All faculty are expected to be effective teachers; such teaching ability is a sine qua non for promotion. Those who cannot demonstrate high ability will not be retained or promoted.⁶ Some of the elements to be evaluated in determining teaching effectiveness are knowledge of subject matter, skill in presentation, experience, interest in student learning, creativity, ability to stimulate thinking, enthusiastic devotion to teaching, integrity, versatility, and capacity for cooperation with colleagues and administration in the achievement of discipline, Department, and College instructional goals. In this regard, Applicants will be expected to build a portfolio with the assistance of the Department and College that clearly documents teaching effectiveness from multiple perspectives. Acceptable kinds of evidence for evaluating teaching performance are detailed in Appendix A, Review Documentation.

2. Research

The University of Michigan-Dearborn and the College of Business recognize a spectrum of research types which meet promotion requirements. Consistent with Boyer (SCHOLARSHIP REVISITED), the University of Michigan-Dearborn and the College of Business values the scholarship of discovery (seeking knowledge), the scholarship of synthesis (building upon and combining previous findings to develop new approaches), the scholarship of application (attempting to solve practical problems), and the scholarship of teaching (transforming and extending knowledge through classroom-based activities).⁷

Applicants must demonstrate scholarly capability as described in Appendix A: Review Documentation. Experience indicates that substantial research or scholarly output has become a central focus of tenure and promotion decisions. Strong teaching and service contributions alone or primarily will not result in promotion, either to Associate or Full Professor. Most Applicants who have difficulty getting tenure or promoted to Full Professor do so because of a weak or inadequate record of research and scholarship. For promotion to Full Professor with tenure as well as to Associate Professor with tenure, experience dictates a record of sustained quality research is paramount.⁸

Acceptable kinds of evidence for evaluating research are detailed in Appendix A, Review Documentation.

3. Service

Faculty are expected to be conscientious department/college citizens. Participation in the affairs of the department is expected, especially where the faculty member can make substantive contributions (e.g. curriculum, advising, etc.). For Assistant Professors' service at the campus level and off campus is encouraged, but should not interfere with the establishment of a program of teaching and research. For promotion to Full Professor, a broadening of the service component is valued.⁹ Because service is essential and necessary for the functioning of the university, service

⁶ [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#), Article II – Campus-Wide Promotion and Tenure Procedures

⁷ [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#), Article II – Campus-Wide Promotion and Tenure Procedures

⁸ [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures, Article II](#) – Campus-Wide Promotion and Tenure Procedures

⁹ [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures, Article II](#) – Campus-Wide Promotion and Tenure Procedures

for promotion to Full Professor should include components of leadership and/or impact whether internal or external to the College of Business. Service performed for compensation will not be considered as a substantive contribution.

Acceptable kinds of evidence for evaluating service are detailed in Appendix A, Review Documentation.

4. Discrete Evaluation

As a matter of practice, faculty shall be evaluated on their own merits against a standard of excellence. Evaluation committees should not compare Applicants in a competitive way against each other as if to rank them. Each promotion and/or tenure decision is independent of all other decisions.

C. TENURE PROBATIONARY PERIOD (“TENURE CLOCK”)

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) or the decision to award tenure to a non-tenured Associate Professor or Professor is normally six years.¹⁰ This period may be somewhat shorter for those with previous full-time service at other institutions, or for those whose performance is exceptional. All promotion decisions and tenure awards will be effective at the beginning of the academic year after the decision is approved by the Regents.

Under some circumstances there may be an exclusion of years of countable service from the tenure clock. These circumstances are generally governed by the Standard Practice Guide and include but are not limited to:

SPG 201.92 Childbirth; SPG 201.92 Dependent Care; SPG 201.13 Health, Personal Emergencies, and other Extenuating Circumstances

The University and the faculty member should confirm in writing that they have agreed to exclude one or more years of service from the years that the University will count toward the six-year total. This exclusion has the practical effect of extending the time to a mandatory tenure review.

D. REPRESENTATIVE

1. Selection of a Representative

For the promotion and/or tenure reviews, the Department Chair shall select a Representative for the Applicant. The selection shall be in consultation with and acceptable to the Applicant. The Representative shall typically be an Eligible Faculty member who is familiar with the Applicant’s work. However, if there are no such faculty members available or willing to serve as Representative, the Representative shall be the senior tenured faculty member in the Applicant’s discipline (or in the department if there are no tenured faculty members in that discipline). If the Applicant so desires, s/he can choose to act as his/her own Representative for presenting the Review Documentation to the RPT Committees. However, they shall not be present during the actual deliberations of the RPT Committees.

¹⁰ [The University of Michigan Faculty Handbook](#) (6.C) provides for a probation period of up to ten years. This section further provides that Colleges and Schools may review untenured faculty members for tenure in the eighth or ninth year of the probationary period. This period of time constitutes the school or college’s “tenure clock”, which may not exceed the University’s tenure clock.

2. **Task of the Representative**

In cases other than where the Applicant is acting as his/her own Representative, the Representative will discuss the record with the Applicant and familiarize her/himself with the Applicant's teaching, research and service record so that s/he can present the applicant's case throughout the review process. That is, the Representative presents the case and answers questions at both the Department RPT Committee and the College RPT Committee meetings. However, the Representative stays in the room participates in the deliberations only if s/he is also a member of that RPT Committee. The Representative must not reveal to the Applicant confidential information such as deliberations of the RPT Committees or external review letters. The Representative may assist the Applicant in selecting external reviewers.

E. **PROCEDURES**

1. **General Information Regarding Vote**

a) ***Vote is by Secret Ballot***

In deliberations at both the Department and College RPT Committees, voting shall be by secret, written ballot, and except in the obvious case of unanimous votes, no one shall discuss how s/he voted or what was the final vote.

b) ***Vote by Faculty are Recommendations to Higher Levels***

It is of course understood that all recommendations at the Department and College levels are simply recommendations to higher levels in the promotion/tenure chain, which goes through the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (in consultation with the members of the Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee), the Chancellor, the President (in consultation with the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs), and the Board of Regents.

c) ***Vote Required to Pass a Motion***

Because of the importance placed on each member being present and being able to take part in the deliberations, faculty are allowed to vote remotely after synchronous attendance in the discussion of the candidate's promotion and/or tenure case in exceptional circumstances such as non-local sabbaticals, conferences, or personal emergencies. It is the responsibility of the remotely participating faculty member to decide on a faculty or staff member as their designee and to inform the department chair or the Representative who their designee is prior to the meeting. Once the deliberations are over, the remotely participating faculty should communicate their vote to their designee, who will then deliver their vote confidentially to the person recording the vote.

A motion shall pass if the majority of RPT Committee members (excluding the Department Chair and/or Dean) participating (present or remotely) in the meeting vote in favor of a motion.

Recommendations from the Department RPT Committee and the College RPT Committee shall include a listing of the number of votes cast for each of the following four choices – Excellent, Significantly Capable, Competent, and Unsatisfactory – with regards to teaching, research, and service (each is a separate vote). There shall be no vote with regard to the overall decision.

2. **Initiation of Process**

On or before March 1, any faculty member (other than those who are contractually required to be Applicants for promotion and/or tenure the following academic year) who would like to be an Applicant for promotion and/or tenure in the following academic year shall notify the Dean and Department Chair in writing of her/his intent to pursue promotion and/or tenure.

3. **External Evaluation of Research¹¹**

The Applicant's research materials must be reviewed by at least five external reviewers. The external reviewers shall be selected by the Department Chair from a pool of at least ten possible outside reviewers. This pool shall be developed by the Applicant, the Department Chair, and the Applicant's discipline faculty. The Applicant shall submit the names of five possible outside reviewers to the Department Chair to be part of this pool. The Department Chair, in consultation with and approval of the Eligible Faculty from the Applicant's discipline shall also select an additional five outside reviewers to be part of this pool. From this pool, the Department Chair shall select at least five external reviewers (including at least two from among those recommended by the Applicant) to review the Applicant's research.

The external reviewers must hold a rank at or above the rank for which the Applicant is being considered for promotion. If the circumstances necessitate letters from out-of-rank reviewers, those should be explained. Those chosen for the outside evaluation should have the scholarly credentials to enable them to offer an objective expert opinion, and in general they ought to come from institutions of high caliber, where research and publications are appropriately esteemed. Ordinarily, the external reviewers should be scholars whose work is not closely identified with that of the Applicant, for example, as a dissertation advisor or as a coauthor. It is the responsibility of the Applicant to make known any special association or relations with an external reviewer.

The evaluations should be regarded as advisory rather than binding since the final responsibility for assessing research remains with the appropriate review committees and the appropriate administrative officers of the University of Michigan-Dearborn and the University of Michigan.

4. **Department Level Process**

a) ***Department RPT Committee Charge with respect to Promotion and Tenure***

The Department RPT Committee is responsible for the initial review of the promotion and/or tenure case. It is expected that the committee will examine the case and make its recommendation on the basis of the Review Documentation and External Evaluation of Research. Of particular importance is the committee's assessment of the Applicant's potential for significant and continuing contributions to the discipline, department, college, and campus.¹²

b) ***Department RPT Committee Chair***

Except as provided in the next paragraph, the Department Chair shall serve as the Chair of the Department RPT Committee. The Department Chair shall not vote since s/he will be making their own independent recommendation.

¹¹ Information to develop this section is from [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#), Article IV – Department Level Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

¹² [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#), Article IV – Department Level Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

In cases where the Department Chair is not an Eligible Faculty member, a chairperson, with vote, shall be chosen from among the members of the Department RPT Committee by these members, and this ad hoc chairperson shall perform all of the duties of the Chair whom s/he replaces. However, except in cases where the Department Chair is the Applicant, because of higher administrative responsibilities, a Department Chair replaced in the above circumstances shall have the privilege of meeting with the Department RPT Committee to hear their rationale(s) for their decisions (both affirmative and negative).

When a recommendation (positive or negative) for promotion and tenure is forwarded to the College of Business Dean, it shall include a written narrative relating to each of the areas of teaching, research, and service that describes the Department RPT Committee's key deliberations and a record of the vote counts. The written narrative shall be prepared by the Representative (or by a designated Department RPT Committee member if the Representative is not a member of the Department RPT Committee) and shared with the Department RPT Committee within three business days of the committee meeting. In case of any disagreement with the written narrative, the Department RPT Committee shall vote on the narratives related to each of the areas of teaching, research, and service.¹³ This narrative shall be submitted to the Dean's office together with the Department RPT Committee's voting outcome as to promotion and/or tenure, within seven business days of the departmental meeting. This same information shall be concurrently shared with the Applicant. The Applicant can submit a written response to the above within five business days to the Dean's Office, if s/he wishes to do so.

c) *Department Chair*

If the Department Chair is an Eligible Faculty member and is not the Applicant, s/he shall make a separate recommendation as to promotion and/or tenure within seven business days of the Department RPT Committee meeting. The Department Chair shall forward to the Dean's office the Review Documentation and the Department Chair's recommendation, which shall include a narrative. The Chair's recommendation shall be shared concurrently with the Applicant. The Applicant can submit a written response to the recommendation within five business days to the Dean's Office, if s/he wishes to do so. The Chair is obligated to inform the Department RPT Committee if the Chair's recommendation differs from that of the committee.¹⁴ Furthermore, if the Chair should decide to make a recommendation differing from the committee, s/he must make clear that this is being done in her/his capacity as an administrator and not as chairperson of the committee.

In cases where the Department Chair is not an Eligible Faculty member, s/he will not make a separate recommendation but instead write a forwarding note to accompany the recommendation from the Department RPT Committee.

d) *Withdrawal of Application by Applicant*

Applications for tenure (including those for tenure before the scheduled tenure-decision year) cannot be withdrawn by the Applicant once the Department RPT Committee has met to vote on the case. However, applications for promotion to Full Professor can be withdrawn at any stage prior to the case reaching the Dean for her/his decision.

¹³ [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#), Article IV – Department Level Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

¹⁴ [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#), Article IV – Department Level Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

5. College Level Process

a) *Information Forwarded to Dean*

The Department Chair shall forward to the Dean's office the following information: (i) Review Documentation and External Evaluation of Research; (ii) written narrative of the Department's recommendation; (iii) Department's vote on the case; (iv) Department Chair's recommendation; and (v) Applicant's written response letters, if any.¹⁵ These materials will constitute the Applicant's record for purposes of review by the Executive Committee.

b) *College RPT Committee*

The College RPT Committee shall review the case and make its decision on the Applicant's record which shall include: (i) Review Documentation and External Evaluation of Research; (ii) written narrative and vote of the Department RPT Committee; (iii) Department Chair's recommendation; and (iv) Applicant's written response letters, if any.¹⁶ The College RPT Committee shall forward to the Dean's office the committee's recommendation, which shall include a narrative and vote. The College RPT Committee's recommendation shall be shared concurrently with the Applicant. The Applicant can submit a written response to the recommendation within five business days to the Dean's Office, if s/he wishes to do so.

c) *College RPT Committee Chair*

Except as provided in the next paragraph, the Dean shall serve as the Chair of the College RPT Committee. The Dean shall not vote since s/he will be making their own independent recommendation.

In cases where the Dean is an Associate Professor and considerations of promotion to Professor are involved, a chairperson, with vote, shall be chosen from among the other members by these members, and this ad hoc chairperson shall perform all of the duties of the Dean whom s/he replaces. However, except in cases where the Dean is the Applicant, because of higher administrative responsibilities, a Dean replaced in the above circumstances shall have the privilege of meeting with the College RPT Committee to hear their rationale(s) for its decisions (both affirmative and negative). The Dean must forward to the next level all cases, but s/he may accompany them, as usual, with personal evaluations (positive and negative).

d) *The Dean*

If the Dean is not the Applicant, s/he shall make the final recommendation as to promotion and/or tenure. Her/his recommendation shall take into consideration the Review Documentation, the Department RPT Committee's narrative, the Department Chair's recommendation, and the College RPT Committee's narrative. The Dean's recommendation shall be shared concurrently with the Applicant. The Applicant can submit a written response to the recommendation within five business days to the Dean's Office, if s/he wishes to do so. The Dean is obligated to inform the College RPT Committee if her/his recommendation differs from that of the College RPT Committee.¹⁷ Furthermore, if the Dean should decide to make recommendations differing from the committee, s/he must

¹⁵ [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#), Article III – College Level Promotion and Tenure Procedures

¹⁶ [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#), Article III – College Level Promotion and Tenure Procedures

¹⁷ [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#), Article III – College Level Promotion and Tenure Procedures

make clear that this is being done in her/his capacity as an administrator and not as chairperson of the committee.

The Dean's Office shall forward to the Office of the Provost the following materials: (i) the written narrative of the Department RPT Committee; (ii) the Department Chair's recommendation; (iii) the College RPT Committee's written narrative; (iv) the Dean's recommendation; (v) the Applicant's written response letters, if any, and (vi) all other documents specified in the University's checklist for promotion and tenure casebooks.

6. Promotion and/or Tenure Process Timetable

The following is only a suggested timetable for the promotion and/or tenure process. Failure to follow this timetable shall not constitute a right to appeal a negative decision to promote and/or grant tenure.

On or before March 1 of the year preceding the promotion and/or tenure year, any faculty member (other than those who are contractually required to be Applicants for promotion and/or tenure the following year) who intends to pursue promotion and/or tenure must send notice to the Dean and Department Chair of such intent pursuant to Section 6E2.

On or before April 1 of the year preceding the promotion and/or tenure year, an Representative for the Applicant shall be selected in accordance with Section 6D1 (Selection of a Representative).

On or before May 1 of the promotion and/or tenure year, the Applicant shall provide names of External Reviewers to the Department Chair in accordance with Section 6E3 (External Evaluation of Research).

On or before July 1 of the promotion and/or tenure year, the Applicant shall submit a brief research statement, CV, and research dossier to the department chair. The Department Chair shall send these documents to the External Reviewers.

On or before September 1 of the promotion and/or tenure year, the Applicant shall submit his/her complete Review Documentation to the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall share the Review Documentation with all tenured members of the Applicant's Department, the College RPT Committee, and the Dean's Office.

Sometime during October/November of the promotion and/or tenure year, the Department RPT Committee meeting shall be held. The Department Chair shall solicit feasible meeting times from the committee members. The date and time of the meeting shall be selected based on the criterion of maximizing committee member participation.

Generally, within three weeks of the receipt of the Applicant's material in the Dean's office, the College RPT Committee shall hold its promotion and/or tenure meeting.

Following the College RPT Committee meeting, the Dean shall make his/her recommendation and forward the necessary documents to the Office of the Provost by the deadline designated by the Provost for receipt of all promotion and/or tenure cases. The Dean and others involved should not make public announcements about the results until the process is completed.

Prior to a committee meeting at any stage of the process, the applicant can submit additional documents to supplement his/her portfolio if there has been a substantial change in its contents.

SECTION 7: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND REVIEW OF LEO FACULTY

All lecturers teaching in the College of Business (“College”) are subject to the terms and conditions of a collective bargaining agreement (“Agreement”) between The University of Michigan and the Lecturers’ Employee Organization, AFT Michigan Local 6244, AFL-CIO. Evaluation of performance is governed by Article XIX of the agreement. Appointments, Major Review, and Renewal are governed by Article XI.

A. ANNUAL REPORT GUIDELINES AND SPECIFICATIONS – ALL LECTURERS

Once per academic year, the College will notify all Lecturers of their obligation to submit this report and its due date. The due date will normally be the date set by the College for all faculty to return their AACSB faculty qualification form -- usually June 30 each year.

All Lecturers who work during any part of the annual report period shall be required to submit an annual report, with the exception of Lecturers who are resigning or retiring from the University before the next Fall or Winter semester.

The annual report will identify and summarize the Lecturer’s performance and achievement relevant to his/her assigned duties during the past year. Note: The College routinely collects syllabi and student teaching evaluations for all courses during the academic year; these will be included by the college in the annual report and do not have to be submitted again by the Lecturer.

The Annual Report must include: (Note: If any of these items are unchanged from the previous year’s annual report, they can be marked as such and need not be submitted again).

1. The AACSB faculty qualification form required of all College of Business faculty.
2. The Lecturer’s current CV.
3. A self-assessment (typically one to two pages) of teaching, including efforts to improve teaching skills and ensure academic integrity, and any issues which have arisen concerning such issues as grading, instructional delivery, and availability to students.
4. Grade distributions (a spreadsheet will be supplied to facilitate calculations) including a brief explanation/rationale for each undergraduate course in which the grade point average is greater than 3.1 and each graduate course in which the grade point average is greater than 3.7.
5. Classroom materials. For one course, please supply exams, significant assignments, and a sample of handouts. Unless you teach only one class or this is your first year submitting an annual report, please submit materials for a different class than you submitted last year.
6. If applicable, an update (typically one page or less) on any suggestions or areas of concern raised during the previous year’s annual, interim, major, and/or continuing review process(es).
7. For Lecturers III and IV only, please provide a list of the following (narrative not needed):
 - a. Service activities, including such things as service on departmental, college, or university committees, curricular initiatives, and service to the profession.
 - b. Professional development efforts including efforts to maintain faculty qualifications as defined by AACSB and the College of Business.
 - c. A plan for professional development in the coming year.
8. Addition of any other relevant evidence the lecturer wishes to supply.

The annual report will be reviewed by the Department Chair and written feedback will be provided if the Department Chair believes improvement is needed in one or more areas. This letter will be added to the Lecturer's personnel file.

A Lecturer who fails to submit an annual report in a timely manner may, at the discretion of the Department Chair, be denied the annual increase provided in Article XV.A.2. as follows:

- a) The Department Chair shall provide the Lecturer with written notice via email of its intent to deny the annual increase.
- b) Within seven (7) days of the date of the written notice, the Lecturer may submit the annual report and/or provide the academic unit with an explanation of his or her failure to submit the annual report.
- c) After considering any explanation provided by the Lecturer, the Department Chair will confirm in writing their final decision with respect to the annual increase.

B. INTERIM REVIEW – LECTURERS I AND III

Following initial appointment as a Lecturer I or III, by no later than the end of the fifth semester (i.e. Fall or Winter) of appointment an interim review shall be conducted. An assessment of the review materials will be conducted and a written summary of the evaluation will be provided to the Lecturer and placed in the Lecturer's personnel file. The written summary will be considered during the Lecturer's subsequent major review.

Interim review materials consist of:

1. The Lecturer's current and previous annual reports, and written Department Chair feedback (if any)
2. Reports of class observation
 - a. To be scheduled in consultation with the Lecturer
 - b. To be conducted by a member of the Lecturer Review Committee or their designee
 - c. Only one visit to one course is required per year, though others may be scheduled at the Lecturer's request
3. Lecturer response to any of the above items

C. MAJOR REVIEW – LECTURERS I-IV

Major reviews are conducted in accordance with the schedule set forth in Article XI.B of the Agreement. A major review shall be conducted by a committee of no fewer than three members who will review, evaluate, and make recommendations to the Department Chair. A thorough assessment of review materials will be conducted and a written summary of the evaluation will be provided to the Lecturer and placed in the Lecturer's personnel file.

Major review materials consist of:

1. The Lecturer's current and previous annual reports, and written Department Chair feedback (if any)
2. Reports of class observation
 - a. To be scheduled in consultation with the Lecturer
 - b. To be conducted by a member of the Lecturer Review Committee or their designee
 - c. Only one visit to one course is required per year, though others may be scheduled at the Lecturer's request
3. Feedback letters given during Interim review (if initial major review)

4. Feedback letters given during Major review (if second major review)
5. Lecturer response to any of the above items

Time toward major review:

1. Lecturer I
 - a. Lecturer I's who have held appointments for eight (8) consecutive Fall and Winter semesters, or have worked at least eight (8) of the last ten (10) Fall and Winter semesters, whichever occurs first, shall undergo an initial major review.
 - b. If the eight semester of service occurs during a Fall semester, it is the practice of the Department to perform the major review during the subsequent Winter semester.
2. Lecturer II
 - a. Lecturer II's shall undergo a second major review in the final year of his or her appointment.
3. Lecturer III
 - a. Lecturer III's who have held appointment for up to but no more than 4 academic years shall undergo a major review during the last year of employment in the Lecturer III title.
4. Lecturer IV
 - a. A Lecturer IV shall undergo a second major review during the final year of his/her appointment.

D. CONTINUING REVIEW – LECTURERS II AND IV

Lecturers II and IV who have successfully completed two major reviews shall undergo a continuing review prior to the conclusion of their appointment and occurring every seven (7) years thereafter. An assessment of the review materials will be conducted and a written summary of the evaluation will be provided to the Lecturer and placed in the Lecturer's personnel file.

Continuing review materials consist of the Lecturer's current and previous annual reports and written department chair feedback (if any), and feedback letters given during the most recent major or continuing review of the Lecturer (which have already been collected by the College). In addition, the College requires a brief statement by the Lecturer that reflects on the Lecturer's performance since their last review and growth in pedagogy, teaching, service (if applicable), outlining challenges and triumphs, and, most importantly, future directions, including a discussion of plans and resources.

E. ADJUNCT AND INTERMITTENT LECTURER REVIEWS

Adjunct Titles: Pursuant to Article XIX.B.5.b-c, a Lecturer appointed in an adjunct or intermittent title shall, upon written request, undergo a review after his/her fifth year of service in an adjunct or intermittent appointment. The Lecturer shall, upon written request, undergo a second review after his/her ninth year of service in an adjunct or intermittent appointment.

An assessment of the review materials will be conducted and a written summary of the evaluation will be provided to the Lecturer and placed in the Lecturer's personnel file.

Review materials consist of:

1. The Lecturer's current and previous annual reports, and written Department Chair feedback (if any). Requirements for annual reports shall be similar to those for LEO I and II.

2. Reports of class observation
 - a. To be scheduled in consultation with the Lecturer
 - b. To be conducted by a member of the Lecturer Review Committee or their designee
 - c. Only one visit to one course is required per year, though others may be scheduled at the Lecturer's request
3. Lecturer response to any of the above items

SECTION 8: DISMISSALS

Regents' Bylaws Section 5.09 shall be followed for matters relating to dismissals, demotions, or terminal appointments of Professorial Staff.

APPENDIX A – REVIEW DOCUMENTATION

Note: The following 3 sections apply to all Promotion & Tenure (P&T) cases as applicable.

1. Teaching

Evaluation of teaching shall be based on a review of a portfolio that clearly documents teaching effectiveness. Review Documentation of teaching accomplishments shall include:

1. Statement of teaching philosophy
2. Self-evaluation of teaching
3. Discussion of efforts to improve student performance based on assurance of learning results
4. Discussion of efforts to improve teaching performance (courses taken, seminars attended, etc.)
5. Syllabi for the previous four semesters¹⁸
6. Significant course assignments/projects; copies of graded assignments/projects including those assignments/projects which received the highest grade and the median grade
7. Copies of exams (including the final exam)
8. Evidence of teaching effectiveness (**a, b and c REQUIRED for promotion and/or tenure; a and c REQUIRED for reappointment**)
 - a. Summary of College of Business approved teaching evaluations for each course taught for each semester under review with comparisons to departmental and college scores^{19,20}
 - b. For each instructional delivery method, at least one other method to substantiate teaching effectiveness (e.g. peer observation^{21,22}, survey of graduates²³)
 - c. All original teaching evaluations including comments
9. Summary of grade distributions for each course taught for each semester under review
10. An explanation/rationale for each undergraduate course in which the mean grade distribution is greater than 3.1
11. An explanation/rationale for each graduate course in which the mean grade distribution is greater than 3.7
12. Description of measures to ensure academic honesty
13. Evaluations from any public lectures, if any
14. Evaluations from any faculty seminars, if any
15. Evaluations from guest lectures in another teacher's class, if any
16. Teaching awards (or nominations for teaching awards), if any
17. Description of new courses developed and creation of teaching aids, if any
18. Other documentation demonstrating teaching effectiveness, if any

¹⁸ The faculty member may need a complete set of syllabi and assignments for the tenure package.

¹⁹ [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#), Article II – Campus-Wide Promotion and Tenure Procedures

²⁰ For those courses within enrolments of less than ten students, significantly lower weight may be given to the course evaluations.

²¹.

²² Faculty members may, at any time, ask colleagues to visit their classes for personal or official purposes. The faculty member may include her/his colleague's comments as part of the Review Documentation. However, if one wishes to use these visits as a method should, in consultation with her/his Chair, select a member of the Department who will submit to the Chair a written evaluation of the teaching performances based on no fewer than three visitations over a year's time.

²³ The survey should be provided to entire classes which are representative of courses taught during the period under review.

2. Research

The College of Business recognizes a spectrum of research types which meet promotion and/or tenure requirements. Consistent with the College's mission, the scholarship of discovery, synthesis, application, and teaching are valued. As such, the College of Business values (I) discipline – based scholarship, including interdisciplinary research, which contributes to the theories or knowledge of business disciplines, (II) practice oriented research which influences business professionals, and (III) pedagogical research which contributes to learning.

While the peer-reviewed journal articles are generally given the most weight in determining research excellence, other research outcomes are valued and may be submitted as part of the Review Documentation to help establish a case for research excellence. Other outcomes may include: research monographs; scholarly books; chapters in scholarly books; textbooks; proceedings from scholarly meetings; papers presented at academic or professional meetings; papers presented at faculty research seminars; publications in trade journals; book reviews; published cases with instructional materials; technical reports related to funded research projects; and instructional software that is widely used. These other outcomes may be given weight comparable to that of peer reviewed journal articles, if such outcomes are subject to a similarly rigorous review process.

Evidence of sustained output through time is essential. Research published, accepted for publication, or presented at conferences prior to commencing employment at the University of Michigan-Dearborn will be acknowledged. However, in determining scholarly capability, significantly more weight will be given to those research outcomes accepted for publication or presented at conferences while employed at the University of Michigan-Dearborn. The number of publications that meet minimum standards varies by discipline, but research progress beyond that done in graduate school is expected regardless of discipline. Finally, quality of research is more significant than quantity of research when determining research excellence, and in no case will an absolute number substitute for quality.²⁴

Review Documentation of research accomplishments shall include:

1. Statement of research philosophy
2. Copies of papers published in refereed journals
3. Summary of each paper published in refereed journals including abstract, date accepted for publication, explanation of and percent contribution to paper, article impact, and evidence of journal quality.^{25,26}
4. Copies of papers under review at refereed journal, if any, including the journal title, co-authors, date of submission, and current submission status (e.g. revise and resubmit, etc.)
5. Copies of current working papers, if any, including the expected publication outlet, expected date of submission to journal/conference, co-authors, and current status

²⁴ [UM-Dearborn Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#), Article II – Campus-Wide Promotion and Tenure Procedures.

²⁵ If a faculty member publishes in a journal that is not included in the superior, very good, good, or other lists, the faculty member may request that a specific journal be included in, or reclassified to, one of these lists. Description of the journal's review process, quality of reviewers, inclusion in an online research database, etc. may be forwarded to the Executive Committee for evaluation and possible revision of the list(s). It is the faculty member's responsibility to make a clear and convincing case that the journal (including a journal not in the business discipline) meets requirements that are equivalent to those of journals in one of the lists.

²⁶ A journal ranked as superior, very good, or good in any one discipline will be counted equally across all disciplines.

6. Copies of papers presented at conferences, if any, including conference title, paper title, co-authors, and conference dates
7. Copies of any other research outcome including date accepted for publication, explanation of and percent contribution to the outcome, review process, and evidence of quality of the outlet
8. Research awards or grants, if any
9. Other documentation demonstrating research performance, if any

3. Service

Participation in service activities is valued and expected. In an institution in which faculty governance is fundamental, faculty member should be willing and able to perform a variety of Departmental, School, Campus and University services. Service activities include but are not limited to active participation in committee work at the Department, School, Campus and University levels; service on task forces for the development and/or evaluation of programs and facilities related to the reshaping or expansion of the Campus or University; advising students; initiating constructive revisions to curricula; promoting scholarly, creative, or social activities; and service to the faculty member's discipline.

Review Documentation shall include:

1. List of Department, College and University service activities including the name of the committee, role (member/chair), frequency of meetings, level of participation, and dates of service
2. List of service to the discipline including name of the organization, name of the committee, role (member/chair), nature of service, level of participation, and dates of service
3. When applicable, copies of reports from the committees on which the faculty member has served²⁷

²⁷ As a matter of policy, committee reports should always acknowledge those who wrote or drafted them, and copies of relevant ones should be filed with dossiers of each Applicant.