DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY
PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The College has established a set of principles and best practices involved in evaluating junior faculty for tenure and promotion to associate professor. The Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB) has used these to develop the specific procedures described below that will be followed in our department. For faculty with joint appointments with other units, the specific procedures for evaluation for tenure and promotion for each case will be specified in a joint letter to the new faculty member from the Chairs or Directors of all units involved.

Promotion in EEB will be granted only to candidates who have demonstrated excellence in research, teaching, service, and, as appropriate, curation. Excellent research should have a demonstrable impact on the area of study to which it is meant to contribute and should provide evidence for a strong presumption of future distinction. Excellent teaching should be demonstrated by evidence of a strong motivation to engage students in the learning process, by the rigor and scope of the courses taught, and by student and peer evaluations of the course and instructor.

Candidates will be notified of all requests for information described below at least two months before the relevant deadline.

I. SELECTION OF EXTERNAL ASSESSORS

1. By April 1 in the academic year preceding the Department’s recommendation to the College regarding tenure, candidates are to provide the Chair with a list of 8 scientists and scholars whom they consider appropriate to assess their work. With each name, the candidate should provide complete contact information and a brief biography indicating the research area and professional stature of the potential reviewer.

   i) Candidates may include their dissertation and/or post-doctoral fellowship supervisors in this list; otherwise, the names should not include scientific collaborators or co-authors within the last ten years.

   ii) Candidates should indicate to the Chair the names of persons they consider inappropriate to assess their work by reason of conflict of interest, or kinship or domestic relationship, and should indicate why they consider these persons inappropriate. In such cases, the Chair should not ask these persons to provide external assessments. Intellectual disagreements do not constitute conflict of interest and are not grounds for exclusion as a potential assessor.

2. The Chair will consult with the Tenure Review Panel for additional names of potential reviewers for a total list of at least 18 reviewers. For candidates with joint appointments in a museum unit, this list should include some reviewers appropriate for assessing
curatorial contributions. From this list, the Chair will choose 12-14 names from whom to request letters of evaluation, assuring that at least three external assessments are from persons suggested by the candidate. When at least three such external assessments are not provided because the persons suggested by the candidate declined to write or did not respond to requests, these exceptions shall be documented at the end of the list of assessors in the file that goes to the departmental decision making body and the College.

II. CANDIDATE SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS FOR CONSIDERATION BY EXTERNAL ASSESSORS, THE TENURE REVIEW PANEL, THE DEPARTMENTAL DECISION-MAKING BODY AND THE COLLEGE

By June 1 of the academic year preceding the review, the candidate should provide copies of:

i) a current curriculum vitae;
ii) a teaching statement (five page maximum);
iii) a research statement (five page maximum);
iv) copies of his or her written work, including studies that have been accepted and are in press, but not yet published, and
v) for candidates with a curatorial appointment, a curatorial statement.

The research and teaching statements should address a general intellectual audience and the candidate is encouraged to ask colleagues, especially former members of a Divisional Evaluation Committee or the College Executive Committee, to review drafts of the statements. Potentially relevant topics for the teaching statement include: main objectives at each level of instruction (including mentorships), genesis of the candidate's pedagogical and curricular innovations, evolution of teaching style, and explanations of especially good or bad performance in particular classes or terms taught, and plans for future teaching. Potentially relevant topics for the research statement include: the conceptual areas addressed, how components of the research program fit together, specific contributions made during the UM tenure-track period, false starts in procurement of funding or execution of the research program, exact role(s) in collaborative work, and plans for future research. Potentially relevant topics for the curatorial statement include: goals for the candidate's curatorial work, genesis of innovations and major contributions, how curatorial research feeds into the candidates research and vice versa, and plans for future curatorial activities.

Classroom evaluation: Senior faculty conducting the classroom visits will be given a protocol to guide them in evaluating the class, and CRLT will be asked to help develop this protocol.

Before the tenure evaluation, each member of the Tenure Review Panel or an ad hoc committee will visit one class of the larger-enrollment course of the assistant professor undergoing review. This evaluation will be done during either the second semester of the year before tenure evaluation or early in the semester of tenure evaluation, timing
dependent on when the larger-enrollment course is taught. This report will be included in the tenure packet.

III. DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR PREPARING AND REVIEWING THE COMPLETED TENURE FILE

1. **By April 1**, the Department Chair, with the advice of the Promotions and Merit Committee, will appoint a committee of three faculty, typically at the rank of full professor, to serve as the Tenure Review Panel for each assistant professor undergoing evaluation for tenure and promotion. At least one of the committee members will be a member of the PMC and one member should be designated as closely associated with the candidate’s research specialty. For candidates with a curatorial appointment, at least one member of the Tenure Review Panel should also have a curatorial appointment.

The Department Chair will notify the candidate of the composition of the Tenure Review Panel **no later than April 10**. The candidate shall have the opportunity to review the membership of the Tenure Review Panel to ensure that the candidate’s field and methodology are represented on the group and to challenge the faculty person designated as being most closely associated with the candidate’s research specialty. Any conflicts over the composition of the decision-making body may be brought to the Associate Dean for Natural Sciences in consultation with the Chair. Any challenges must be brought to the Chair within one week of notification to the candidate of composition of the decision-making body.

2. The Chair will be responsible for requesting external letters of assessment no later than **July 1** of the year preceding consideration for tenure. The Tenure Review Panel will be responsible for preparing the completed tenure file, with all documents listed in II above and the external letters of assessments. They are also responsible for writing a preliminary tenure report that summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the record in relation to tenure and for revising this report in light of the candidate’s response (see item 3, below).

3. The candidate has a right to respond to the preliminary report on his or her suitability for tenure before the Tenure Review Panel forwards its report to the decision-making body. Toward that end, the Chair should forward to the candidate the preliminary tenure report prepared by the Tenure Review Panel. The Chair will invite the candidate to respond to any inaccuracies, misunderstandings of the work, or failures to contextualize the work appropriately.

i) Maintaining confidentiality in the preliminary tenure report to the candidate is critical; this summary must protect absolutely the identity of the external assessors. While the strengths and weaknesses this summary enumerates will be consistent with those described in the report that the Tenure Review Panel sends to the decision-making body and prepares for discussion by the College, the summary for the candidate must not quote directly from letters of
assessment, and it must not include any markers that would enable the candidate to identify who wrote the letters of assessment.

ii) The candidate will have a minimum of two weeks to respond to the preliminary tenure report. If the candidate chooses not to respond, she/he should submit a written statement to that effect.

iii) The candidate may choose to modify the teaching, research, and, as appropriate, curatorial statements in response to this preliminary report; if done, the modified statements shall be the ones included in the file that is forwarded to the College.

4. Evaluation of the tenure file and report prepared by the Tenure Review Panel and voting on a recommendation to the College will be done by a decision-making body appointed by September 30 of the year in which the candidate will be considered for tenure.

i) For candidates with 100% appointments in the Department, the decision-making body will be composed of nine faculty members. Two of the members shall be members of the candidate’s Tenure Review Panel; however, all three members of the Panel cannot be on the voting body according to LSA rules. At least two will be members of the Promotions and Merit Committee. The rest of the membership of the decision-making body will be composed of all tenured professors on the Executive Committee plus a number of appointed members necessary to bring the total voting membership up to nine. For candidates with a curatorial appointment, at least two of the voting members will also have curatorial appointments. Appointments will be made by the Chair in consultation with the PMC. The Chair, Associate Chairs, and, if appropriate, Director of the museum unit will be non-voting members of the decision-making body, for a total of up to eleven or twelve members. However, if insufficient faculty of appropriate rank are available to reach a total of nine voting members, the Associate Chairs and then the Museum Director may be appointed as voting members of the decision-making body. A quorum for any meeting of the decision-making body shall consist of eight of the nine voting members.

ii) For candidates with appointments that are joint with other units, the decision-making body will consist of four members of the other unit plus five voting members from the Department. The Department component will include two of the members of the Tenure Review Panel, two members of the PMC, and one tenured member of the Executive Committee. Appointments will be made by the Chair in consultation with the Promotions and Merit Committee. The Chair and Associate Chair will be non-voting members of the decision-making body, for a total of eight members from the Department on the joint Tenure Panel. Four voting members from each of the participating units shall constitute a quorum for any meeting of the joint decision-making body. The details of the tenure procedure will be spelled out in a joint letter from the Chairs (or Chair
and Director) of the two units written to the candidate in her/his first year in
the Department.

iii) The candidate shall have the opportunity to review the membership of the
decision-making body to ensure that the candidate’s field and methodology
are represented on the group and to challenge the faculty person designated
as being most closely associated with the candidate’s research specialty. Any
conflicts over the composition of the decision-making body may be brought to
the Associate Dean for Natural Sciences in consultation with the Chair. Any
challenges must be brought to the Chair within one week of notification to the
candidate of composition of the decision-making body.

5. The decision-making body will receive from the Tenure Review Panel the tenure file
concerning the achievements and external evaluations of the candidate being considered
for tenure. Members of the voting body are expected to fully participate in the evaluation
of each candidate for tenure, including the examination of all relevant documents. After
thorough discussion, the group will vote on whether or not to recommend to the College
of LSA that the candidate be recommended for promotion and tenure. The Department
Chair will designate a member of the Tenure Review Panel to develop a full and frank
summary of these deliberations as the final report of the unit’s assessment of the
candidate to be included in the report to the College.

IV. MAKING A RECOMMENDATION ON TENURE AND PROMOTION TO THE COLLEGE OF LSA

1. The Tenure Review Panel will prepare a final report to the College, based on the tenure
report, taking into account the candidate’s response and the decision-making body’s
discussion and recommendation.

2. The numerical vote of the decision-making body shall be reported by the Chair to the
College, along with the final report by the Tenure Review Panel.

3. A positive vote by at least 2/3 of the decision-making body members will constitute a
positive recommendation. Abstentions will be counted as negative votes.

4. The Chair will provide a cover letter for the tenure packet to be provided to the College.
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