



Applies to: LSA Research Faculty  
Related Policies: N/A  
Date Issued:  
Date Revised: January 2016  
Owner: LSA Office of the Dean - Research  
Primary Contact: Research Process Senior Manager

**Appointments at the Rank of**  
**Associate Research Scientist, Research Scientist,**  
**Research Associate Professor and Research Professor**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. Overview & Contact Information
  2. Positions
  3. Advertisement
  4. Posting
  5. Search
  6. Background Checks
  7. External Evaluations
  8. Requesting Authority to Extend the Offer
  9. Divisional Evaluation Committee
  10. Executive Committee
  11. Informal Negotiation with the Candidate
  12. Provost
  13. Extending the Offer
  14. Candidate's Decision
  15. Board of Regents
  16. Appointment Paperwork
- 
- Appendix 1. Checklist for the Unit's Internal Tracking
  - Appendix 2. LSA Research Faculty Unit Commitment Form
  - Appendix 3a. Research Scientist Hiring Package checklist
  - Appendix 3b. Research Professor Hiring Package checklist
  - Appendix 4. Sample Advertisement
  - Appendix 5. Template Request for Waiver of Posting
  - Appendix 6. Template Letters Soliciting External Reviews (Revised 1/15/16)
  - Appendix 7. Sample Descriptions of External Reviewers
  - Appendix 8a. Template Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
  - Appendix 8b. LSA Standard and Term-Limited Offer Letter Research Scientist Track
  - Appendix 8c. LSA Standard Offer and Term-Limited Letter Research Professor
  - Appendix 9. LSA specific policies
  - Appendix 10. UMOR policy and process document entitled "Research Scientist and Research Professor Tracks Appointments and Promotions"

### 1. Overview & Divisional Affairs-Research Office CONTACT INFORMATION

Appointments for Research Faculty in the College of Literature Science and the Arts are governed by the UMOR policy and process document “Research Scientist and Research Professor Tracks Appointments and Promotions” (see Appendix 10). The College Executive Committee has also approved two additional College specific policies that are located in Appendix 9. Packages for appointments should be addressed to the appropriate Divisional Associate Dean.

Please deliver materials and direct questions for recruitment to 2146 LSA Building; phone 647-2151; fax 615-0588.

<b>Name</b>	<b>username</b>	<b>Phone (734)</b>
Douglas Richstone Associate Dean for the Natural Sciences	NaturalSciAD	647-2115
Anne Curzan Associate Dean for the Humanities	HumanitiesAD	647-2115
Elizabeth Cole Associate Dean for the Social Sciences	SocialSciAD	647-2115
Deb Erskine Senior Academic Appointments Specialist	derskine	647-1484
Linda Kentes Senior Manager, Divisional Affairs	lindahb	647-3741
Peggy Westrick Senior Manager, Research Process	pegwest	647-2151

### 2. POSITIONS

Research faculty positions may be established at any time throughout the year. There are two types of research faculty position requests, person-specific and open search.

**Person-specific position requests** are initiated by completing the Research Faculty Department Commitment Form which is then forwarded to the College along with the complete hiring packet (**see Appendices 2 and 3**). A minimum appointment of 5% from non-sponsor funds must be provided by the unit for research faculty.

**Dry Appointments** – If approved, a unit may offer a dry appointment in a corresponding research faculty title to a tenure track faculty member or a funded research faculty member. Please forward to the Divisional Affairs office a letter from the candidate requesting the appointment, the candidate’s research statement, a current CV, and a cover letter of support from the Chair(s)/Director(s). A minimum appointment of 5% from non-sponsor funds must be in place for the funded appointment if offering a research faculty a dry appointment in LSA.

All dry appointments including the 5% minimum appointments will be reviewed yearly by the appointing unit and a request for renewal must be submitted to and approved by the Divisional Associate Dean.

**Open search position requests** require posting via the University's eRecruit system and advertising. Units who are requesting a new position without a candidate in mind must include a new position description form (36200) in addition to the draft posting.

### **3. ADVERTISEMENT**

All open positions need to be advertised. If a unit wishes to post an open position without a candidate in mind it must be also be advertised. Please send a draft advertisement to the Divisional Affairs Research Office for approval. A sample advertisement appears in **Appendix 4**.

Please review information on the International Center's website for details on hiring a foreign national into a faculty position (<http://internationalcenter.umich.edu/immig/hiring.html>). Some positions will require a print ad placed in a national journal in addition to electronic ads if the possibility exists that your hiring unit may later sponsor the individual for permanent residency. Contact the International Center at 763-4081 or [icfacultystaff@umich.edu](mailto:icfacultystaff@umich.edu) to determine if the position will require a national print ad.

Advertisements must:

- describe the position accurately (e.g., appointing unit/s, rank, start date, 12 month appointment)
- specify the criteria that will be used to select among candidates
- request a statement of current and future research plans
- indicate that women and minorities are encouraged to apply
- say that the University of Michigan is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer

Advertisements must not:

- be so restrictive as to preclude applications from a broad spectrum of outstanding candidates.

### **4. POSTING**

Open positions need to be posted inside the University to generate a unique job requisition number. The Online Job Requisition Form can be found within the eRecruit system like tenure track faculty positions.

For person-specific positions you will need a Waiver of Posting. Please send an email request to Tom Palmer ([tpalmer@umich.edu](mailto:tpalmer@umich.edu)). The request should include the candidate's name, rank, and specialty as well as the reason for seeking a waiver (see **Appendix 5** for a template email request).

### **5. SEARCH**

The search process should be consistent with unit rules. Units may find it is useful to consult the handbook prepared by the committee on Science and Technology Recruiting to Increase Diversity and Excellence (STRIDE). This handbook is available at <http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance/STRIDE> or in hard copy from [advanceproject@umich.edu](mailto:advanceproject@umich.edu). While the entire committee is responsible for seeking minority and female candidates, some committees have found it helpful to designate one member to take responsibility for coordinating these efforts. The University requires that search files be kept for a minimum of three years.

## 6. BACKGROUND CHECK

Beginning June 10, 2013, the University began requiring background checks for all newly hired or rehired research-track faculty. People Soft's eRecruit system is being used to manage the background checks for academic personnel much like it is used for staff hiring.

A successful background check is required in order to appoint a prospective research-track faculty candidate. For details on this process please go to

<http://www.lsa.umich.edu/facstaff/academicaffairs/policiesandprocedures/tenuredandtenuretrackfaculty> and select "Academic Personnel Background Checks."

## 7. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

The College requires at least six external evaluations. For Associate Research Scientists and Research Scientists at least five of these must come from "arm's length" reviewers. For Research Associate Professors and Research Professors at least two of these must be selected only by the unit.

**To be at arm's length, a potential reviewer should NOT:**

- have held an appointment in the same unit and at the same time as the candidate, unless that appointment occurred over ten years prior to the candidate's start date;
- have taught or supervised the candidate in graduate school;
- have co-authored grant applications, articles, or books with the candidate, unless the collaboration was over ten years prior to the candidate's expected start date. In some disciplines (e.g., experimental high energy physics) where collaborations are quite large (i.e., hundreds of people), this criterion may be relaxed. Persons who have been co-authors or major research collaborators more than ten years prior to the candidate's expected start date may be considered as arm's length reviewers. Also, when both an outside reviewer and the candidate are members of the same large cooperative/research group that publishes abstracts and manuscripts with an expanded number of co-authors, the outside reviewer can be considered an arm's length reviewer if he/she and the candidate have not personally interacted in the research effort. In these cases, we ask that the chair/director provide a statement noting the absence of a direct collaboration;
- be a close personal friend or someone with whom the candidate has a past or ongoing romantic, sexual, or familial relationship.

Units are encouraged to seek more than five arm's length letters.

These letters should not be written by those with a close personal friendship or by someone with whom the candidate has a past or ongoing romantic, sexual, or familial relationship. Please include all letters you receive in the dossier you send to the College.

## 8. Requesting Authority to Extend the Offer

Once you decide that you wish to extend an offer, please send the file to the LSA Research Office. This file should contain the following information in the order listed below.

- a. Cover memo from the Chair(s) and/or Director(s) to the relevant Divisional Associate Dean. It should be carefully composed to provide information about the record of scholarship in the context of both the field and the unit. It should show that the candidate will have the potential for scholarly development, possibly as part of a research group; an academic record of peer-reviewed publications in which they are a primary

author or co-author; and evidence of participation in relevant academic or professional meetings. The cover memo should also describe the search process.

- b. Description of duties. This information should clearly present the unit's expectations for this person.
- c. Completed LSA Research Faculty Unit Commitment Form (Appendix 2).
- d. Curriculum vitae. Please make sure that this is truly up-to-date, especially in terms of the publication status (accepted, in press, in print) of each piece of written work, and that it contains complete information (e.g., in the documentation of sources, amounts, titles, and PI structure of grant funding).
- e. Non-didactic teaching statement. *If a unit wishes to appoint faculty to Research Associate Professor or Research Professor positions or to move to this rank from the Research Scientist Track, include a summary of the candidate's non-didactic teaching and mentoring activities.*
- f. Candidate's research statement. Include the statement received from the candidate that describes their current and future research interests and objectives.
- g. Copy of template letter(s) soliciting an external evaluation (see templates in Appendix 6). If you have sent one letter to arm's length reviewers and another letter to a mentor or co-author, please include samples of both (see Appendix 6).
- h. External reviewers list (see Section 7 and Appendix 7).
  - Begin with a paragraph describing your process for selecting external reviewers and indicate if each reviewer was recommended by the candidate, the unit, or both.
  - External reviewers are external to the University.
  - For each reviewer indicate whether that reviewer is at arm's length or not, and indicate who chose the reviewer (candidate or unit).
  - For Research Associate Professors and Research Professors, at least two letters must come from reviewers chosen only by the unit.
  - Provide a thorough description for each reviewer listing name, title, affiliation, expertise, and professional standing, and as much detail as possible about publication record and the status of his/her university within the discipline.
  - While most readers will know the significance of membership in the National Academy of Sciences or tenure of a Guggenheim Fellowship it is helpful to explain the significance of lesser known professional standings such as being a fellow of the American Physical Society or the president of the Urban History Association.
  - Explain carefully the reviewer's relationship to the candidate, if any.
  - If contacts with the reviewer were not limited to sending the letter of solicitation, describe the additional contacts.
  - Identify each reviewer by marking their letters with "A", "B", "C", and so on.
  - Throughout the file, refer to the reviewer by letter rather than by name.
- i. External reviewers who declined to provide an evaluation. At the end of the List of External Reviewers, in a separate section, identify each individual who was invited but declined to provide an external evaluation. Include his/her name, title, and affiliation, and indicate who selected the evaluator and whether the person is at arm's length or not. In each case, please report the person's reason for declining to provide an evaluation. There is no need to identify these individuals by "A", "B", "C," etc.
- j. Copies of written responses from reviewers who declined. Please include a copy of each written response (email or letter), when available.
- k. Original letters received from external reviewers (see section 7 above). These must be "arm's length" letters and for hiring at the rank of Research Associate Professor and Research Professor, there must be two from reviewers selected only by the unit.

For the research professor track, insert a separate piece of paper in front of each letter with the biographical paragraph from the External Reviewer List. This is in addition to the required listing discussed in item h above.

Indicate “Reviewer A” at the top of the first letter, “Reviewer B” at the top of the second letter, and so on. Include a translation for each letter not written in English (and name the translator). Include a typed copy of each handwritten letter. The best possible letter is one that is on the letterhead of the reviewer’s current institution. We can also accept faxed and emailed letters that are signed and on letterhead. Please do your best to insure that these letters are legible. If you receive a ‘.pdf’ version of an unsigned letter on letterhead (or a signed letter that is not on letterhead), please include with it a copy of the email to which it was attached. This email must be from the reviewer’s home institution (i.e. “*some university.edu*”). This also applies to cases where the entire evaluation is attached to an email.

- i. Copies of the candidate’s written work provided as a separate .pdf document.
  - This includes important publications and a good sampling of recent written work including, if appropriate, unpublished work.
  - Do not include every entry on the C.V., but do err on the inclusive side when defining “important.”
  - Do include all items mentioned in the external evaluations or in your cover letter.
  - Identify which publications are included by marking an asterisk beside each one on the C.V.
  - Upload a .pdf that includes the candidate’s CV along with his/her publications (in the same order as the works appear on the CV) to SharePoint.
- m. Draft offer letter (Appendix 8b-e) and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU - Appendix 8a). Do not include the draft offer letter or the MOU in the hiring request packet. Email them as separate Word documents to Kathe Harrison ([kdavids@umich.edu](mailto:kdavids@umich.edu)) who will make every effort to have the commitments approved by the time the candidate has been approved by the College Executive Committee. Although a written offer letter may not be sent to the candidate until UMOR and the Provost (for research professor track hires) have granted their approval and we have received approval on the background check, you may begin oral discussions with the candidate once you have received Executive Committee approval (see Section 10). For joint appointments, you must also send a draft Memorandum of Understanding that has been negotiated between the relevant units.

## **9. DIVISIONAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

The Divisional Evaluation Committee (DEC) discusses candidates for Associate Research Scientist, Research Scientist, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor.

The Divisional Evaluation Committee (DEC) assesses the scholarly achievement and stature of every senior candidate for a position in LSA. The DEC does not compare candidates with each other, but against the standard for the rank within the discipline. It does not consider the candidate’s teaching or service. In practice, the DEC places especially great weight on the letters from external reviewers, the candidate’s written work, and the candidate’s research statement; but it also reads carefully the cover memo from the Chair(s)/Director(s) to the Executive Committee. The DEC members may ask for additional information from the unit. This information is typically needed to clarify questions that have arisen in the course of the review of the case. Unfortunately these requests often require an almost immediate response from the unit(s). The DEC does not vote on the candidate’s suitability for appointment; rather, it conveys its views to the Executive Committee via members who serve on both committees.

During Winter Term, each DEC (humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences) normally meets once weekly and considers two or three cases (appointment or promotion). During Fall Term the DEC’s do not meet on a regular basis. To promote genuine engagement of each DEC member with each candidate’s work, the Dean’s Office attempts to provide up to one week between distribution of the file and discussion in the DEC. The sooner the file

is received, the sooner the DEC discussion can be scheduled. To facilitate scheduling, please keep your Divisional Associate Dean informed regarding each of your active searches.

#### **10. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

The College Executive Committee (EC) will also review the dossier and consider the evaluation of the DEC prior to voting on the proposed appointment. The EC does not review the draft Offer Letter or MOU, nor does it approve commitments proposed for the candidate. Please do not include commitments in the cover memo to the EC.

The EC considers the recommendation of the unit(s) and the discussion of the DEC in light of the full record of research before it. Its discussion is informed by the report of the DEC and by the entire appointment request file. It then votes on whether or not to seek authorization from the Provost, if appropriate, and Vice President for Research to extend an offer.

If the EC decides not to endorse the extension of an offer, the unit may request an opportunity to appeal; but requests are not granted automatically. Please contact your Divisional Associate Dean for further information.

#### **11. INFORMAL NEGOTIATION WITH THE CANDIDATE**

Once endorsed by your unit, the appointment may be discussed orally with the candidate. During such conversations, however, please be sure to explain very clearly that no firm commitment can be made until the College Executive Committee, UMOR and, if appropriate, the Provost have authorized the position and the offer letter has been approved.

#### **12. PROVOST AND UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN OFFICE FOR RESEARCH**

Appointments at the level of Associate Research Scientist and Research Scientist require the approval of the Vice President for Research.

Appointments at the level of Research Associate Professor and Research Professor require the approval of the Provost and the Vice President for Research.

#### **13. EXTENDING THE OFFER**

A written offer with an MOU may be sent to the candidate once you have received approval from the LSA Dean's Office that all relevant approvals (EC, Provost, if appropriate, Vice President for Research, and the background check, where appropriate) have been obtained. The approval will be sent in an email to the Chair(s)/Director(s) and Key Ad(s).

If questions arise please contact Peggy Westrick in the LSA Research Office at 747.647.2151. A copy of the letter that has been signed by the Chair(s)/Director(s) and sent to the candidate should be forwarded to her at [pegwest@umich.edu](mailto:pegwest@umich.edu).

#### **14. CANDIDATE'S DECISION**

Please notify the Research Office at [pegwest@umich.edu](mailto:pegwest@umich.edu) as soon as the candidate responds to the offer.

## **15. BOARD OF REGENTS**

No Regents Communication is required.

## **16. APPOINTMENT PAPERWORK**

Once the University has approved the appointment and the candidate has accepted the offer, submit the HR paperwork to Deb Erskine, Senior Academic Appointment Specialist ([derskine@umich.edu](mailto:derskine@umich.edu)) in 2156 LSA.

If the candidate is new to UM, please forward:

- appointment request form,
- notification to unit that background check is complete,
- acceptance letter,
- resignation letter (where applicable),
- faculty personnel record,
- employment eligibility verification (aka I9 form),
- supplemental appointment information form (36100), and

If the candidate has non-resident alien or resident alien tax status, he/she must complete hardcopy tax forms. For more information go to the Payroll web site URL at <http://finops.umich.edu/payroll/forms#t74>.

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **Appointments at the Rank of Associate Research Scientist, Research Scientist, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor FOR UNIT'S INTERNAL TRACKING**

1. Position request discussed with LSA Research Office;
2. Open Position:
  - a. Advertisement approved by the Research Office;
  - b. Position advertised;
  - c. Online Job Requisition Form completed and Job Requisition Number generated;
  - d. Short list of candidates identified and invited to campus (at Unit's expense)
3. Person Specific Position:
  - a. Waiver of posting obtained from Tom Palmer;
  - b. LSA Research Faculty Department Form, draft offer letter and draft MOU, and dossier sent to the Research Office;
4. Unit(s) decision-making completed and candidate selected;
5. Appointment approved by the DEC and College Executive Committee, and unit(s) notified;
6. Offer letter and MOU approved by Dean's Office;
7. Final signed offer sent to candidate and copy sent to the Research Office;
8. Candidate's written acceptance or notification of decline sent to the Research Office;
9. Appointment paperwork sent to the Senior Academic Appointments Specialist (2156 LSA Dean's Office).

**APPENDIX 2**

**LSA RESEARCH FACULTY FORM**

**UNDERSTANDING REGARDING RESEARCH FACULTY UNIT COMMITMENTS**

The department of \_\_\_\_\_ request appointment of:

\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Candidate

at the rank of \_\_\_\_\_

Term Limited Appointment

Term Limited Appointment duration: \_\_\_\_\_

Ongoing Appointment

Unless otherwise specified as a Term Limited Appointment the initial term of the Research Faculty Track appointment will be 3 years.

Funding must be identified for the initial appointment period at the time of appointment (both Term Limited and On-going).

Source of funding for initial appointment \_\_\_\_\_ Shortcode: \_\_\_\_\_

*Note: At most 95% of research faculty salary may be charged to external sponsors. Please provide shortcode for 5% from unit's general fund or other non-sponsor shortcode.*

Source of funding \_\_\_\_\_ Shortcode: \_\_\_\_\_

Initial space assignment: \_\_\_\_\_

As the chair/director of the unit recommending the individual for appointment/promotion, I understand my unit's responsibility for mentoring, promotion review, pre- and post-award support, as described in LSA Policy Documents. Depending on the nature of the appointment, there may be unit obligations for bridging funds. If so, I have made provisions to encumber sufficient funds to provide bridging support in accordance with the schedule established by UMOR (Appendix 8 – Section 14).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Unit

**APPENDIX 3a**

**Checklist for Associate Research Scientist or Research Scientist Dossier**

- Memo from Chair(s)/Director(s) to College EC
- Description of Duties
- Research Faculty Unit Commitment Form
- Curriculum vitae
- Candidate's research statement
- Copy of letter(s) soliciting an external review
- Description of external reviewers who provided evaluations and those who declined to provide an evaluation (include copy of their correspondence)
- Original letters received from external reviewers
- Membership of the search committee (if this was a search)
- Single-sided copies of written work in same order as CV
- Draft offer letter and draft Memo of Understanding (MOU), for joint appts
- Approved advertisement (for an open position) or Waiver of Posting (for person specific request)

### APPENDIX 3a

#### **Checklist for Research Associate Professor or Research Professor Dossier**

- Completed Checklist
- Memo from Chair(s)/Director(s) to College EC
- Description of Duties
- Research Faculty Unit Commitment Form
- Curriculum vitae
- Candidate's statement of non-didactic teaching
- Candidate's research statement
- Candidate's service statement
- Copy of letter(s) soliciting an external review
- Description of external reviewers who provided evaluations and those who declined to provide an evaluation (include copy of their correspondence)
- Original letters received from external reviewers
- Membership of the search committee (if this was a search)
- Approved advertisement (for an open position) or Waiver of Posting (for person specific request)
- Publications in same order as CV uploaded to SharePoint (required - no hard copies please)Background check initiated on candidate
- Draft offer letter and draft Memo of Understanding (MOU), for joint appts, sent as word documents to Peggy or Kathe

### **2015 Electronic Recruitment Casebooks**

Directions for submitting electronic recruitment casebooks and uploading them to SharePoint.

#### **Casebook for junior or senior casebooks (optional – can submit hard copy to Divisional Affairs or upload a .pdf to SharePoint.)**

- Create one PDF document of the dossier in the order of the recruitment checklist (Appendix 3a).
- Name the file: lastname, firstname Recruitment Dossier (labeled the same for all ranks).
- Go to the LSA [SharePoint site](#) (you may need to log in with username and Kerberos password).
- Click on your department folder, click add document, and upload the file. (Note: If you're working on a joint recruitment, upload to the proposed administrative home folder).

#### **Publications for senior casebooks (required)**

- Create one PDF document that includes a current C.V. (with an asterisk next to each publication included in the file) and the publications in the order they appear on the C.V.
- Name the file: lastname, firstname Recruitment Publications.
- Go to the LSA [SharePoint site](#) (you may need to log in with username and Kerberos password).
- Click on your department folder, click add document, and upload the file. Note: If you're working on a joint recruitment upload to the proposed administrative home folder.

Questions?

Mandy Harrison, [amvogel@umich.edu](mailto:amvogel@umich.edu) or 615-0659

## **APPENDIX 4**

### **Appointments at the Rank of Associate Scientist, Research Scientist, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor**

#### **SAMPLE ADVERTISEMENT**

The University of Michigan **[unit(s)] [is/are]** seeking qualified applicants for a 12-month appointment in **[specify area and specific research expertise and experience required]**. Applications should be sent to **[Chair/Director], [unit(s)]**, University of Michigan, **[address]**, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1xxx **[or email link]**. Candidates should furnish a letter of application, curriculum vitae, statement of current and future research plans, and names of suggested reviewers. The search committee will begin reviewing applications on **[date]** and will continue until an appointment is made. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. The University of Michigan is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

APPENDIX 5

**TEMPLATE REQUEST FOR A WAIVER OF POSTING**

To: Tom Palmer  
From: [unit staff person]  
Date:  
Re: [Name]

This brief note is to request a waiver of posting in order to offer [Name] an appointment as [associate research scientist/research scientist/research associate professor/research professor]. The candidacy of Dr. [Name] presents a unique opportunity [provide brief statement of details]. [She/He] is trained as an [provide details] and is also an expert on a wide range of [provide details].

The addition of Dr. [Name] to our faculty would create an unusual chance for [provide details].

Please let me know if further information would prove helpful in facilitating this request. Thank you.

**Note:**

If any of the following are pertinent, please include a reference:

- 1 if the request is on a fast track for an upcoming Executive Committee meeting;
- 2 if placement will improve the diversity of the unit's faculty;
- 3 if the person is a 'star'.

cc: [staff person in other unit – if joint]

LSA Research Office, LSA Dean's Office

## APPENDIX 6

Appointments at the Rank of

Associate Scientist, Research Scientist,

Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor

### LETTERS SOLICITING EXTERNAL REVIEWS

#### TEMPLATE LETTER TO AN ARM'S-LENGTH REVIEWER

(items in **bold** should be modified appropriately)

[Date]

Dear Professor [Name]:

The [Unit(s)] at the University of Michigan [is/are] considering [Candidate Name] for appointment to the research track faculty at the rank of [Associate Research Scientist/Research Scientist/Research Associate Professor/Research Professor] in [Unit] [(if joint) and [TITLE] in (Unit)]. This is a non-tenure-track appointment. Faculty at the University of Michigan on the research track are appointed on the basis of research, scholarly, and/or creative contributions; mentoring; and service. Recognition of the quality of their work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process. We value your candid assessment of [Candidate Name]'s research accomplishments and future promise, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Your scholarly and professional judgments will play an important part in our evaluation of [Candidate Name] for appointment here.

Based on the enclosed materials and any other knowledge you have of [his/her] work or professional accomplishments, we would like your candid evaluation of [Candidate Name]'s written and scholarly contributions in relation to others of comparable experience in [his/her] field. In particular, we would appreciate your comments on the following issues:

1. Have you ever met the candidate personally? If so, how long and in what capacities have you known the candidate? What are the extent and nature of your current contacts with the candidate?
2. What are your impressions about the quality, quantity, focus, and scholarly impact of [**Candidate Name**]'s works?
3. How would you estimate [**Candidate Name**]'s standing in relation to others in [his/her] peer group who are working in the same field? At a comparable stage of their careers, did the field's currently important figures have records stronger or weaker than that of the candidate?
4. Which, if any, of the scholarly publications or works do you consider to be outstanding? Why?
5. How would you evaluate [**Candidate Name**]'s service contributions to the discipline; that is, [his/her] work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?
6. Might [his/her] work meet the requirements for someone being considered for appointment at your institution? Should [he/she] receive this appointment at the University of Michigan?

*[The following paragraph (word-for-word) must be included in*

*ALL letters soliciting an evaluation of the candidate.]*

Questions sometimes arise about the confidentiality of external review letters, and we do want to advise you that your letter will be reviewed by senior faculty at the University of Michigan. Because the University is a public institution, legal considerations limit our ability to assure confidentiality, but it is our practice not to release external review letters unless required to do so by law.

Kindly provide us with your evaluation before [**date**]. We also would appreciate it if you would send us a short biosketch along with a brief description of your areas of expertise and current research interests.

We realize that your schedule is full and that this may be a time-consuming task; however, we will be most grateful for your assistance. We have selected you because of your expertise in this area. Should you fail to respond, this will be so noted in the record. If you need further information, before or after

you decide to help, please contact **[me/us]** at 734-\_\_\_\_\_ (voice), 734-\_\_\_\_\_ (fax), or  
[\\_\\_\\_\\_\\_@umich.edu](mailto:_____@umich.edu).

Sincerely,

**[Name]**

Chair/Director

**[Name, if joint]**

Chair/Director

Enclosures:   Candidate's curriculum vitae  
                  Non-didactic teaching statement (if research professor track)  
                  Research statement  
                  Selected publications

TEMPLATE LETTER TO A NON-ARM'S-LENGTH REVIEWER

(items in **bold** should be modified appropriately)

[Date]

Dear Professor [Name]:

The [Unit(s)] at the University of Michigan [is/are] considering [Candidate Name] for appointment to the research track faculty at the rank of **[Associate Research Scientist/Research Scientist/Research Associate Professor/Research Professor]** in [Unit] [(if joint) **and [TITLE] in (Unit)**]. This is a non-tenure-track appointment. Faculty at the University of Michigan on the research track are appointed on the basis of research, scholarly, and/or creative contributions; mentoring; and service. Recognition of the quality of their work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process. We value your candid assessment of [Candidate Name]'s research accomplishments and future promise, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Your scholarly and professional judgments will play an important part in our evaluation of [Candidate Name] for appointment here.

Based on the enclosed materials and any other knowledge you have of [his/her] work or professional accomplishments, we would like your candid evaluation of [Candidate Name]'s written and scholarly contributions in relation to others of comparable experience in [his/her] field. In particular, we would appreciate your comments on the following issues:

1. How long and in what capacities have you known the candidate? What are the extent and nature of your current contacts with the candidate?
2. What are your impressions about the quality, quantity, focus, and scholarly impact of [Candidate Name]'s works? How important is this expertise in **[unit or area of study]** today? Would appointment of the candidate broaden and strengthen our faculty?

3. If you supervised the candidate's doctoral dissertation or post-doctoral fellowship, how would you assess [her/his] success at establishing and implementing [his/her] own program of research? If you have collaborated with the candidate on scholarly work or research grants, how would you characterize [her/his] role in your joint activities?
4. How would you estimate [Candidate Name]'s standing in relation to others in [his/her] peer group who are working in the same field for a similar length of time? At a comparable stage of their careers, did the field's current important figures have records stronger or weaker than that of the candidate?
5. Which, if any, of the scholarly publications or works do you consider to be outstanding? Why?
6. Might [his/her] work meet the requirements for someone being considered for appointment at your institution? Should [he/she] receive this appointment at the University of Michigan?

*[The following paragraph (word-for-word) must be included in*

*ALL letters soliciting an evaluation of the candidate.]*

Questions sometimes arise about the confidentiality of external review letters, and we do want to advise you that your letter will be reviewed by senior faculty at the University of Michigan. Because the University is a public institution, legal considerations limit our ability to assure confidentiality, but it is our practice not to release external review letters unless required to do so by law.

Kindly provide us with your evaluation before [date]. We also would appreciate it if you would send us a short biosketch along with a brief description of your areas of expertise and current research interests.

We realize that your schedule is full and that this may be a time-consuming task; however, we will be most grateful for your assistance. We have selected you because of your expertise in this area. Should you fail to respond, this will be so noted in the record. If you need further information, before or after you decide to help, please contact [me/us] at 734-\_\_\_\_\_ (voice), 734-\_\_\_\_\_ (fax), or [\\_\\_\\_\\_\\_@umich.edu](mailto:_____@umich.edu).

Sincerely,

**[Name]**

Chair/Director

**[Name, if joint]**

Chair/Director

Enclosures: Candidate's curriculum vitae

Non-didactic teaching statement (if research professor track)

Research statement

Selected publications

## APPENDIX 7

### **Appointments at the Rank of Associate Scientist, Research Scientist, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor**

#### SAMPLE

#### External Reviewers List

#### **DESCRIPTION OF REVIEWER SELECTION PROCESS**

Reviewers were selected by the following process: The unit Executive Committee named 6 reviewers. The candidate submitted a list of 7 possible reviewers that included her dissertation advisor and post-doctoral mentor. The candidate also named one person as being in conflict with the candidate. The unit determined it was appropriate to exclude this reviewer. There were 4 names included on both lists of reviewers. The Executive Committee did not include the individual with whom the candidate had a conflict. The Executive Committee decided to request letters from 9 individuals: 3 identified only by the candidate, 4 only by the department, and 2 by both. 6 letters were received (5 arms-length, 1 not).

**DESCRIPTION OF EXTERNAL REVIEWERS** [this sample includes entries from external reviewer lists for several different candidates.]

- A. **Leslie Kanes Weisman** is Professor of Architecture at the New Jersey Institute of Technology. Professor Weisman has been one of the pioneers of feminist criticism in architecture. She co-founded the Women's School of Planning and Architecture in 1974. Among her many publications is her book, *Discrimination by design: A feminist critique of the man-made environment*. **Suggested by the candidate (arms-length)**.
- B. **Charles Donahue, Jr.** is the Paul A. Freund Professor of Law at Harvard University, where he teaches property and legal history. He was previously a member of the University Michigan Law School faculty. He is coauthor of a leading casebook on the law of real property and has written extensively about property and legal history. **Suggested by the department (arms-length)**.
- C. **Kenneth Helphand** is Professor of Landscape Architecture at the University of Oregon and Fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architecture. Professor Helphand is co-editor of *Landscape Architecture*, the profession's leading peer-reviewed journal. He is one of the most respected scholars in the field of landscape architecture and author of two highly regarded works on vernacular landscape criticism. **Suggested by the candidate (arms-length)**.
- D. **Jeremy Waldron** is the Maurice and Hilda Friedman Professor Emeritus of Law at Columbia University where he taught course in jurisprudence and legal theory. He was previously a member of faculty of the University of California, Berkeley School of Law and was the dissertation advisor of the candidate. He is the author of a book on the theory of private property. **Suggested by the department (arms-length)**.
- E. **Nan Ellin** is Professor of Urban Design and Planning, College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning, at the University of Cincinnati. Professor Ellin is one of the most vigorous scholars at the cutting edge of architectural discourse. The author of the highly praised *Post-modern Urbanism* (published by Blackwell Press

and reissued by Princeton Architectural Press), has helped to bridge the gap between architectural discourse and contemporary cultural criticism. Professor Ellin was co-author on several articles with the candidate. **Suggested by the candidate (non-arms-length).**

- F. **Mark Carson** is a Research Staff Member in the Physical Sciences Department of the IBM T. J. Watson Research Center in Yorktown Heights, NY. His career focus has been condensed matter physics. He is a Fellow of the American Physical Society and Editor of the *International Journal of Quantum Information*. He was selected as an external reviewer because he is widely recognized as a leader in the field of quantum computing and quantum control. He was appointed as the Van der Waals Professor of Physics at the Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Amsterdam. This is an honorary professorship. **Suggested by both the department and the candidate (arms-length).**

**DESCRIPTION OF REVIEWERS WHO DECLINED** [please remember to include a copy of their email, when available]

**Gregory S. Alexander** declined to provide an evaluation because of his limited knowledge of the candidate's work. He is Professor of Law at Cornell Law School, where he teaches real property, property theory, and estate and trust law. He recently wrote a book on property theory that received an award for best law book of 1997 from the American Publishers Association. **Suggested by the department (arm's-length).**

**Joshua Michaels** declined to provide an evaluation due to having already agreed to do a large number of reviews for other candidates. He is the Morrison Professor of Environmental Law at the University of Chicago where he teaches environmental law and natural resources. He was previously a member of the University of Michigan Law School faculty. He has written extensively about the control of environmental resources. **Suggested by the candidate and the department (not arms-length).**

**Carol M. Rose** declined to provide an evaluation because she is out of the country. She is the Gordon Bradford Tweedy Professor of Law and Organization at Yale Law School, where she teaches property, contracts, environmental law, land use planning, and natural resources law. She was previously on the faculties of the Stanford Law School, University of California at Berkeley, Northwestern, and University of Chicago. She is co-author of a casebook on property law and is a leading scholar on property theory. **Suggested by the department (arms-length).**

## APPENDIX 8a

Appointments at the Rank of

**Associate Scientist, Research Scientist,  
Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor**

### LSA Memorandum of Understanding Additional Characteristics of Research Faculty Appointments

Incumbent: NAME1  
Title: POSITION TITLE  
Unit: UNIT NAME  
Date: DATE

*[Note to hiring unit: The intent of this MOU is to address other characteristics of research faculty appointments that are not included in the University's standard offer letter for research faculty. These include the four (4) items for which the required language is indicated below (items in blue) and four (4) items for which the school/college/units must develop their own language. The MOU should also include any other school./college/unit unit specific items, and care should be taken to insure that the MOU is consistent with the offer letter. **This template HAS BEEN MODIFIED TO INCLUDE COLLEGE REQUIRED INFORMATION.**]*

- Research faculty appointments are without tenure. While possible, it is unlikely that a research faculty position will be converted to an appointment in the instructional (tenure) track at the University of Michigan.*
- Continuation of a research faculty appointment is subject to performance that meets or exceeds the appointing unit and University criteria and the availability of continued funding.*
- The mentoring and career development of research faculty is an important issue. Helpful information is provided in "Giving and Getting Career Advice: A Guide for Junior and Senior Research Faculty" developed by the UM ADVANCE Program and the Office of the Vice President for Research. Consult with your unit leadership on this issue.*
- **(for Research Investigators)** The College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, in rare cases, appoints into the Research Investigator rank. This title is limited to candidates who, while meeting all other requirements, have not yet completed their PhD. Movement from Research Investigator to Assistant Research Scientist should normally occur within one year of initial appointment (must happen within two years) and is automatic once the candidate presents proof of having a PhD degree conferred. The date that the candidate moves to the Assistant Research Scientist is the date the clock begins on the new appointment.*
- **(for Assistant Research Scientists)** The University has a mandatory unit review policy for Assistant Research Scientist appointments: a mandatory unit level review by the third (3rd) year and a mandatory University level review by the sixth (6th) year. Consult the <sup>25</sup>University and school/college/unit policies provided with this MOU for the detailed policies governing your appointment.*

- *A statement clarifying the annual review process that includes who is responsible for performance evaluations and salary increase decisions.*
- *A statement indicating the source(s) of support for the first three years of the appointment. If this is a time-limited appointment, the appointment duration must be in the offer letter.*
- *A statement clarifying the unit's expectation for research faculty to generate their salary support on sponsored funds.*
- *A statement indicating the UMOR, department, school/college/unit policies for bridging support associated with the position, as applicable.*

Attachments to include with the MOU:

- 1 University and School/College/Unit Policies for the Appointment and Promotion of Research Faculty (this includes the University base guidelines).
- 2 *“Giving and Getting Career Advice: A Guide for Junior and Senior Research Faculty”* developed by the UM ADVANCE Program and the Office of the Vice President for Research.
- 3 UMOR Policy on Bridging Support

**APPENDIX 8b**

LSA STANDARD OFFER LETTER for

**NORMAL APPOINTMENT or TERM LIMITED in the RESEARCH SCIENTIST TRACK**

DATE

NAME1

ADDRESS

Dear NAME1:

I am pleased to offer you the [*regular full-time 12 month X%*] [*term-limited 100%*] effort position of **POSITION TITLE** in **UNIT NAME**. The annual compensation for this position will be **SALARY**, plus the University's standard benefits. The [*start date for this position will be DAY, DATE*] [*term of this appointment will be Start Day, Date to End Day, DATE*].

As a member of the research faculty, you are expected to perform basic or applied research in an area of considerable complexity, with responsibility for identifying and selecting the problems to be studied, the approach to solving them, and the organization and presentation of results obtained. You may also participate in non-didactic instructional activities, in mentoring and supervising undergraduate and graduate students engaged in research activities, and as a member of dissertation committees.

This offer of employment is contingent on the successful completion of a background screening. In order to begin this process, please link now to the University's eRecruit system <http://umjobs.org/> and enter your information for posting # [*enter posting number*]. Our vendor, General Information Services (GIS), will be contacting you directly via e-mail for additional information needed to complete this process. It is critical that you complete this information as soon as possible to expedite your hire process. This offer is also contingent on your securing valid immigration status and work authorization before your expected start date and maintaining your valid immigration status and work authorization throughout your employment. The University's International Center is committed to working with the hiring unit and new faculty hires to provide assistance and guidance with immigration issues.

If this position is acceptable to you, please endorse below and return a copy to me. If you have questions regarding this offer, please feel free to discuss them with NAME2 (CONTACT INFO).

Sincerely,

NAME3

I accept the position of POSITION TITLE in UNIT NAME as described above:

---

NAME1

Date

Attachment: MOU

Cc: Divisional Affairs

**APPENDIX 8c**

STANDARD OFFER LETTER for

**NORMAL or Term Limited APPOINTMENT in the RESEARCH PROFESSOR TRACK**

DATE

NAME1

ADDRESS

Dear NAME1:

I am pleased to offer you the [*regular full-time 12 month X%*] [*term-limited 100%*] effort position of **POSITION TITLE** in **UNIT NAME**. The annual compensation for this position will be **SALARY**, plus the University's standard benefits. The [*start date for this position will be DAY, DATE*] [*term of this appointment will be Start Day, Date to End Day, DATE*].

As a member of the research faculty, you are expected to perform basic or applied research in an area of considerable complexity, with responsibility for identifying and selecting the problems to be studied, the approach to solving them, and the organization and presentation of results obtained. You are also expected to participate in substantial non-didactic teaching and mentoring of postdoctoral fellows, junior research colleagues, or students at any level within the context of your field of research, and possibly as a member or co-chair of dissertation committees.

This offer of employment is contingent on the successful completion of a background screening. In order to begin this process, please link now to the University's eRecruit system <http://umjobs.org/> and enter your information for posting # [*enter posting number*]. Our vendor, General Information Services (GIS), will be contacting you directly via e-mail for additional information needed to complete this process. It is critical that you complete this information as soon as possible to expedite your hire process. This offer is also contingent on your securing valid immigration status and work authorization before your expected start date and maintaining your valid immigration status and work authorization throughout your employment. The University's International Center is committed to working with the hiring unit and new faculty hires to provide assistance and guidance with immigration issues.



## APPENDIX 9

### **LSA-specific policies**

#### **Research Scientist track**

Entry level appointments are typically made at the level of Assistant Research Scientist. In rare cases, appointments may be made at the Research Investigator rank. However, in LSA the Research Investigator rank is limited to candidates who, while meeting all other requirements, have not yet completed their Ph.D. Promotion from Research Investigator to Assistant Research Scientist must occur within two years of initial appointment and is automatic once the candidate presents proof of having earned a Ph.D. degree.

#### **Research Professor Track**

LSA does not appoint Research Assistant Professors. Appointments at the rank of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor require a research record that is equivalent to that of the corresponding tenure-track appointment.

## **APPENDIX 10**

<http://research.umich.edu/policies/research-faculty/appointments-and-promotions/>

# **POLICIES ON APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS FOR RESEARCH SCIENTIST AND RESEARCH PROFESSOR TRACKS**

## **Research Faculty Home**

**NOTE: Changes to this document made Nov. 7, 2013 are summarized here.**

## **CONTENTS**

1. **Appointment Authority**
    - **Ann Arbor Campus**
    - **Dearborn and Flint Campuses**
  2. **Guidelines for the Appointment and Promotion of Research Faculty**  
Issued by the Office of Research and the Offices of the Provost (Ann Arbor, Dearborn and Flint Campuses)
- 

## **CRITICAL INFORMATION**

3. **Resource Commitment to Create a New Research Faculty Position and Appointment Structure(s)**
  4. **Notice of Non-Reappointment**
  5. **Time-in-Rank and Mandatory Reviews**
  6. **Extension of Time to Review for Childbearing or Dependent Care**
  7. **Criteria for Entry into the Research Scientist Track versus the Research Professor Track**
  8. **Performance-Based Terminations**
- 
9. **Criteria for Appointment and Promotion to Research Faculty Ranks**
    - Research Scientist Track
    - Research Professor Track
  10. **Expectations Regarding Appointments and Promotions**
    - Research and Scholarly Contributions
    - Independence
    - Service
    - Teaching
  11. **Time-in-Rank Limits for Research Investigator and Mandatory Review Cycles for the Research Scientist Track**
  12. **Mandatory Review Cycles for the Research Professor Track**
  13. **Appointment Date Calculation**

14. [Movement Between the Research Scientist Track and the Research Professor Track](#)
15. [Special Cases](#)
  - Dry Research Faculty Appointments
  - Adjunct Research Faculty Appointments
  - Visiting Research Faculty Appointments
16. [Bridging Support for Research Faculty](#)
17. [Reduction-in-Force](#)
18. [Research Faculty Governance](#)

## Appendices

### [Unit Specific Procedures for Appointments and Promotions](#)

*Sections 1-17 of this document serve as the University's base guidelines for research faculty appointments and promotions in both the **Research Scientist Track** and **Research Professor Track**. Appointing units may adopt more restrictive criteria. When the approved, unit specific guidelines (see appendices) include more restrictive criteria, these criteria govern appointments and promotions made in the unit.*

#### **1. Appointment Authority**

Contingent on the approval of guidelines for the appointment of research faculty consistent with Regents Bylaw 5.24 *Research Scientists and Research Professors*, the delegation of authority to appoint and promote research faculty is described below.

##### **Ann Arbor Campus**

The Deans of the Schools and Colleges and the Directors of the Institute for Social Research (ISR) and the Life Sciences Institute (LSI) have the authority to appoint individuals to the rank of Research Investigator, and to appoint or promote to the ranks of Assistant Research Scientist and Research Assistant Professor, as delegated to him/her by the Vice President for Research and the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Appointment or promotion to the ranks of Associate Research Scientist and Research Scientist require the recommendation of the Dean or Director and then the approval of the Vice President for Research.

Appointment or promotion to the ranks of Research Associate Professor and Research Professor require the recommendation of the Dean or Director, the review and consent of the Vice President for Research, and the approval of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

##### **Dearborn and Flint Campuses**

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs has the authority to appoint individuals to the rank of Research Investigator, and to appoint or promote to the ranks of Assistant Research Scientist and Research Assistant Professor, as delegated to him/her by the Vice President for Research. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs may at his/her discretion delegate this appointment authority to the Deans at the school/college level.

Appointment or promotion to the ranks of Associate Research Scientist and Research Scientist require the recommendation of the Dean, the review and consent of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the approval of the Vice President for Research.

Appointment or promotion to the ranks of Research Associate Professor and Research Professor require the recommendation of the Dean, the review and consent of the Vice President for Research, and the approval of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

In the rest of this document, the term “designated authority” will be used to signify the individuals identified in this section as having that authority.

## **2. Guidelines for the Appointment and Promotion of Research Faculty Issued by the Office Research and the Offices of the Provost (Ann Arbor, Dearborn and Flint campuses)**

The Office of Research and the Office of the Provost on each campus annually review and issue guidelines for the appointment and promotion of research faculty at the ranks of Associate Research Scientist, Research Scientist, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor, where applicable. Current guidelines and other information regarding research faculty are available on the following websites:

Provost’s Office (Ann Arbor) – <http://www.provost.umich.edu/>

Provost’s Office (Dearborn) – <http://www.umd.umich.edu/provost/>

Provost’s Office (Flint) – <http://www.umflint.edu/provost/>

Research – <http://research.umich.edu/>

---

## **CRITICAL INFORMATION**

### **3. Resource Commitment to Create a New Research Faculty Position**

#### Resource Commitment

Research faculty appointments are established with the expectation that the research faculty member will participate in and/or develop a sustainable research program. To create a new position the appointing unit is required to identify funding sources (current and anticipated) that are reasonably expected to support the first three years of the appointment.

#### Appointment Structure(s)

Research Investigator appointments are established as an annual, renewable appointment with a maximum duration of four years. (Reference: [Section 10](#))

Assistant Research Scientist appointments are initially established for a three-year term. Based on a positive assessment at the mandatory third year review the faculty member may be appointed to a second three-year term. The results of the sixth year review determine future appointment structure. (Reference: [Section 10](#))

Research Assistant Professor appointments are initially established for a three-year term. Based on a positive assessment at the mandatory third year review the faculty member may be appointed for a second term. The duration of the second term will vary by school/college: see [Section 11](#).

Note: Section 13 [“Appointment Date Calculation”](#) should be referenced to determine the appropriate end date for the term appointment.

All research faculty appointments at the associate level or higher are established as open-ended appointments.

Special Case: Term-limited appointments are to be used when the period of appointment is aligned with the requirements of a specific project and there is no expectation of developing a research program.

Note: All layoffs due to lack of funding must be approved by Academic HR and UMOR per [Section 17: Reduction-in-Force](#).

#### **4. Notice of Non-Reappointment**

All term-limited appointments are considered terminal upon completion of the terms and conditions of employment. However, for research faculty it is the University’s intent that these individuals receive a notice of non-reappointment at least 90-days prior to their end date.

For all other non-disciplinary actions (e.g. RIF, performance reviews) that result in a termination of the employment relationship the research faculty member should receive a notice of non-reappointment at least 90-days prior to their end date, but not for a period in excess of 1 year.

#### **5. Time-in-Rank and Mandatory Reviews**

The University has established a time-in-rank limit for Research Investigators and mandatory review processes for Assistant Research Scientists and Research Assistant Professors. Associate Research Scientists and Research Associate Professors may request periodic reviews. The specifics for each rank are detailed in this document. The appointing unit must communicate this information to the research faculty member at the time of his/her appointment.

#### **6. Extension of Time to Review for Childbearing or Dependent Care**

Extensions to time of review for research faculty will follow the policy and procedures developed for tenure track instructional faculty as outlined in [SPG201.92](#) “Tenure Probationary Period: Effects on Tenure Clock of Childbearing and Dependent Care Responsibilities.”

#### **7. Criteria for Entry into the Research Scientist Track *versus* the Research Professor Track**

Units must develop specific criteria to determine the appropriate track for newly hired individuals or Research Investigators seeking promotion.

Individuals appointed as **Assistant Research Scientists** should:

1. Have the potential for scholarly development, possibly as part of a research group,
2. Have an academic record of peer-reviewed publications in which they are a primary author or co-author, and
3. Provide evidence of participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.

Additional criteria for individuals appointed as **Research Assistant Professors** are described below:

1. **\*\*Have responsibilities through which they will \*\*** develop a substantial record of non-didactic teaching,
2. Be considered by the appointing unit as having the potential to develop a scholarly reputation at a rate that is consistent with that of an assistant professor on the tenure track, and
3. Be considered by the appointing unit as having the potential to develop a substantial independent research program, which is required for promotion to Research Associate Professor.

More details about the expectations of Assistant Research Scientists and Research Assistant Professors are provided in this document. Units are discouraged from appointing candidates as Research Assistant Professors who do not meet all of the required criteria described above.

## 8. Performance Based Terminations

If the unit decides to terminate a candidate as the result of a review conducted pursuant to these guidelines, a disciplinary review conference under SPG 201.12 is not required.

## 9. Criteria for Appointment and Promotion to Research Faculty Ranks

The criteria for appointment and promotion to research faculty ranks are defined using four fundamental characteristics of all faculty positions: scholarship, teaching, independence, and service. The Research Scientist Track is differentiated from the Research Professor Track on the basis of all four criteria. The level of and potential for scholarship and independence differs between the tracks. Teaching and service are not required activities for any rank in the Research Scientist Track.

In addition to the criteria listed below, candidates for *all* research faculty appointments must have demonstrated personal characteristics consistent with good scholarship and professionalism..

### Research Faculty Rank Specific Criteria for Appointment and Promotion to the Research Scientist Track

#### Research Investigator

Key Characteristic	Requirements
Scholarship	Scholarly reputation equivalent to a person who has recently completed a Ph.D. and/or postdoctoral training.
Independence	Independence not expected, but may be a goal of training.
Teaching	No requirement for teaching.
Service	No requirement for institutional service.

### Assistant Research Scientist

Key Characteristic	Requirements
Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Potential for scholarly development, possibly as part of a larger research program.</li><li>• Record of peer-reviewed publications.</li><li>• Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.</li></ul>
Independence	Independence not required, but may be developing.
Teaching	No requirement for teaching.
Service	No requirement for institutional service.

### Associate Research Scientist

Key Characteristic	Requirements
Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Strong local and growing national scholarly reputation on the basis of research productivity and contributions over several years, possibly as part of a larger research program.</li><li>• Record of peer-reviewed publications.</li><li>• Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.</li></ul>
Independence	Independence not required, but may be developing.
Teaching	No requirement for teaching.
Service	No requirement for institutional service.

### Research Scientist

Key Characteristic	Requirements
Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Strong national and international scholarly reputation on the basis of sustained research productivity and contributions.</li><li>• Substantial record of peer-reviewed publications.</li><li>• Significant, sustained participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.</li></ul>
Independence	A record of independent scholarship and funding.

Teaching	No requirement for teaching.
Service	No requirement for institutional service.

### Research Faculty Rank Specific Criteria for Appointment and Promotion to the Research Professor Track

#### Research Assistant Professor

Key Characteristic	Requirements
Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for scholarly development at a rate consistent with that of an assistant professor on the tenure track.</li> <li>• Record of peer-reviewed publications in which they are a primary author or co-author.</li> <li>• Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.</li> </ul>
Independence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong potential for or documented evidence of extramural funding.</li> <li>• Strong potential for development into an independent scholar</li> </ul>
Teaching	Evidence of, or the potential for, substantial non-didactic teaching and mentoring of postdoctoral fellows, junior research colleagues, or students at any level within the context of one or more research fields (e.g., laboratory bench science, social science, or other disciplinary setting).
Service	Institutional service expected, but not at the level expected for an assistant professor on the tenure track.

#### Research Associate Professor

Key Characteristic	Requirements
Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong local and national reputation on the basis of research productivity and contributions over several years consistent with that of a tenured associate professor.</li> <li>• Substantial record of peer-reviewed publications.</li> <li>• Significant, sustained participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.</li> </ul>
Independence	Independent scholarship and funding.
Teaching	A record of substantial non-didactic teaching and mentoring of postdoctoral fellows, junior research colleagues, or students at any level

	within the context of one or more research fields (e.g., laboratory bench science, social science, or other disciplinary setting).
Service	Institutional service expected, but not at the level expected for an tenured associate professor.

**Research Professor**

Key Characteristic	Requirements
Scholarship	Exemplary and sustained national and international reputation and achievements equivalent to a tenured professor.
Independence	Independent scholarship and independent sustained funding.
Teaching	A record of substantial non-didactic teaching and mentoring of postdoctoral fellows, junior research colleagues, or students at any level within the context of one or more research fields (e.g., laboratory bench science, social science, or other disciplinary setting).
Service	Institutional service expected, but not at the level expected for a tenured professor.

**10. Expectations Regarding Appointments and Promotion**

**Research and Scholarly Contributions**

The basic expressions of a research faculty member’s scholarly work are found in peer-reviewed publications authored and/or co-authored by the research faculty member.

In evaluating the scholarly merit of publications, a major consideration is the level of the researcher’s participation in, and contributions to, the work, especially multi-authored contributions. Peer-reviewed publications are generally expected and preferred. If non peer-reviewed work is offered as part of the portfolio, the appointing unit should seek an assessment of its academic contribution from external reviewers.

It is expected that nominees for the senior ranks (associate and above) will have achieved a level of national or international recognition in their fields. “National and international recognition” means that leaders in the field are able to recognize excellence in the nominee’s published work, and to identify contributions he/she has made to the field. National and international recognition is judged primarily from the responses provided by external “arms-length” reviewers. Additional information may also be obtained based on the frequency of citations of an individual’s publications in the appropriate citation indexes for the field of study.

A record of research funding as a principal investigator from outside sources does not, by itself, guarantee research competence, just as inability to attract research funding does not necessarily demonstrate a lack of research competence. On balance, however, a record of peer-reviewed research funding reflects well on the nominee's standing in the scientific community, and funded research of various types provides evidence that the nominee has satisfied the first two criteria for advancement. Having secured research funding reflects particular credit on the nominee when he/she has obtained it through a competitive, peer-reviewed process at the national level, such as that required by NIH and NSF.

### **Independence**

The scholarly independence of a faculty member is evidenced when he/she undertakes leadership in the conception, execution, and dissemination through publication of important scholarly work. Candidates can demonstrate this by serving as the Principal Investigator on research projects, by serving as the sole author, lead author, or primary author on a fair proportion of publications, by demonstrating other major contributions to the preparation of manuscripts, and by achieving recognition from their peer group through invited lectures, awards, etc. Comments from external reviewers are also used as a measure of the nominee's creativity, initiative and productivity that can reveal the level and growth of a faculty's scholarly independence.

### **Service**

Nominees will have demonstrated a reasonable level of contribution to service at various levels, such as their departments, the school/college, or the University as a whole, as well as in various activities at community, state, national, or international levels.

### **Teaching**

Research Scientist faculty appointments are intended for individuals whose primary activity is research. Faculty appointed on the Research Professor Track are expected to participate in significant levels of non-didactic teaching.

If a research faculty member takes part in instructional track teaching while holding a research faculty appointment, it is expected that the unit for which the research faculty member is teaching will establish a fractional instructional appointment for the teaching. Appointments to non-tenure track instructional titles covered by the collective bargaining agreement between the University and the Lecturers' Employee Organization (LEO) are governed by the terms of that agreement. If a research faculty member accepts a fractional instructional teaching appointment, the appointing unit for his/her research appointment must make arrangements to reduce the percentage of the faculty member's research appointment to the appropriate fractional level, with a corresponding reduction in his/her compensation.

When units evaluate the teaching done by a research faculty member, as described above, they should apply the same criteria the unit uses in evaluating the teaching of instructional faculty.

## **11. Time-in-Rank Limits for Research Investigators and Mandatory Review Cycles for the Research Scientist Track**

For research faculty who hold an active appointment (greater than 0% effort) in the Research Scientist Track, appointing units are expected to undertake the reviews described below. If the research faculty member holds additional faculty appointments, the expectation is that where appropriate, all faculty appointments will be reviewed concurrently.

## **Research Investigator**

After two years in rank, Research Investigators may be promoted to the rank of Assistant Research Scientist or Research Assistant Professor, following review and approval by the appointing unit, consistent with its approved appointment and promotion guidelines.

The University has established a maximum time-in-rank policy for the rank of Research Investigator. After a Research Investigator has been in this position for four years without promotion, the appointing unit must move him/her out of the rank in one of the ways described below.

In the event that the candidate is not qualified for promotion, the unit has two options, as described below, contingent on the approval of the designated authority (see Section 1: *Appointment Authority*).

1. If the unit decides to continue to employ the candidate, the unit may appoint him/her to an appropriate staff position.
2. If the unit decides to terminate the candidate, it must provide appropriate notice to him/her of this decision. The terminal time period must be a minimum of 90 days and may be as long as one year.

The maximum time-in-rank parameters described above apply to all Research Investigators with appointment fractions greater than 80% effort averaged over the four years in rank.

For Research Investigators with less than 80% effort averaged over the four years in rank, units must conduct a complete review during the candidate's fourth year in rank to determine whether the candidate is making sufficient progress for promotion to Assistant Research Scientist. If, based on the review, the appointing unit decides the Research Investigator's progress warrants a continuation in rank, the unit may re-appoint the Research Investigator for up to two more years, contingent on the approval of UMOR.

To ensure newly appointed Research Investigators are aware of the maximum time-in-rank policy, UMOR requires all hiring units to include a signed memorandum of understanding (MOU) that includes a statement about this policy as part of the appointment offer. The MOU should specify that the Research Investigator is entering the Research Scientist Track.

## **Assistant Research Scientist**

The University has established a mandatory review policy for the rank of Assistant Research Scientist.

The first period of appointment will be three years. During the third year of appointment, the appointing unit will perform a review of the candidate. Based on the results of the third-year review, the unit may determine that any of the three possible outcomes listed below are appropriate. Note that if the unit determines that the candidate is not yet qualified for promotion, but is making sufficient progress to remain in rank (outcome #2), the unit does not need to submit a plan to UMOR at the third-year review period.

When an Assistant Research Scientist has been in rank for five years without promotion, the appointing unit must do a comprehensive review during his/her sixth year to determine his/her eligibility for promotion or continuation in rank. The unit must do a full review, compiling a casebook that is equivalent with the unit's procedures for promotion of tenure track instructional faculty. The unit must submit the results of this review to UMOR for review.

If the Assistant Research Scientist also holds a tenure track position in a School or College with a tenure probationary period other than six years in length, the appointing unit for the research appointment may ask UMOR and the relevant Provost's Office to change the length of the review period for the research appointment to the same length as the faculty member's tenure probationary period.

There are three possible outcomes of the third-year and sixth-year reviews, contingent on approval by the designated authority, where applicable. The possible outcomes are described below:

1. Contingent on approval from the designated authority, the appointing unit may promote the candidate to either Associate Research Scientist or Research Associate Professor.
2. The unit may determine that the candidate is not yet qualified for promotion but is making sufficient progress toward meeting the criteria for promotion to remain in the Research Scientist Track as an Assistant Research Scientist.
3. The unit may decide that the candidate is not presently qualified for promotion and that his/her performance to-date is insufficient to justify continuing him/her in the Research Scientist track. The unit may appoint him/her to an appropriate staff position or terminate the candidate's employment, as described below.

For research faculty who are reappointed after the third-year review, the subsequent review will take place in the sixth year, as previously stated.

If, after the sixth-year review, the unit decides to submit a request to UMOR to reappoint the candidate (outcome #2 above), the appointing unit will prepare a professional development plan that will outline what steps, if any, are needed for the candidate to progress toward successfully meeting the promotion criteria at the time of his/her next review. This development plan will include a time frame for a subsequent review. The date of the subsequent review will be determined by the appointing unit contingent on approval by UMOR. The appointing unit will include the development plan in its request to UMOR to reappoint the candidate.

If, at the three-year review, the unit recommends that the candidate be transferred to the Research Professor Track, the candidate may be appointed as a Research Assistant Professor. Nonetheless, the candidate will still undergo the mandatory sixth-year review based on the original appointment date (i.e., after five years from having been appointed as an Assistant Research Scientist).

If the appointing unit decides the candidate is not qualified for promotion or continuation, the unit has two options, as described below. In each case, the Dean or Director of the appointing unit must approve the decision.

1. If the unit wants to continue to employ the candidate, the unit may appoint him/her to an appropriate staff position.
2. If the unit decides to terminate the candidate, it must provide appropriate notice to him/her of this decision. The unit must notify the faculty member at least 90 days before the date on which the unit will terminate his/her appointment or up to or no longer than one year before the date of termination.

Recommendations for continuation as an Assistant Research Scientist, or for promotion to the rank of Associate Research Scientist, require the approval of the Vice President for Research. Recommendations for transfer to the Research Professor Track with promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor require the approval of the relevant Provost, after review and consent from the Vice President for Research. In cases where the Vice President for Research does not consent to the promotion, the VPR will communicate with the relevant Provost about the case.

To ensure newly appointed Assistant Research Scientists are aware of this mandatory review policy, UMOR requires the appointing unit to include a signed MOU that includes a statement about this policy as part of the appointment documentation.

### **Associate Research Scientist**

There is no limit to the amount of time an Associate Research Scientist can remain in rank. The appointing unit may conduct an evaluation for promotion any time after the first three years in rank. On a six-year cycle, the unit must conduct a formal review of the faculty member in response to his/her request.

Recommendations for promotion to Research Scientist must be approved by the Vice President for Research. Recommendations for transfer to the Research Professor Track with promotion to either Research Associate Professor or Research Professor must be approved by the relevant Provost, after review and consent from the Vice President for Research. In cases where the Vice President for Research does not consent to the promotion, the VPR will communicate with the relevant Provost about the case.

### **Research Scientist**

There is no limit to the amount of time a Research Scientist can remain in rank. At any time after the first three years in rank, the appointing unit may conduct an evaluation of the faculty member for promotion to Research Associate Professor or Research Professor. On a six-year cycle, the unit must conduct a formal review of the faculty member in response to his/her request.

Recommendations for promotion to Research Associate Professor or Research Professor require the approval of the relevant Provost, after review and consent from the Vice President for Research. In cases where the Vice President for Research does not consent to the recommendation for promotion, the VPR will communicate with the relevant Provost about the case.

## **12. Mandatory Review Cycles for the Research Professor Track**

*The mandatory review cycle for the research professor track is intended to parallel each school/college's review cycle (tenure clock) for tenure track instructional faculty. Appointing units that are not authorized to appoint tenure track instructional faculty will follow the review cycle used by the majority of the schools/colleges on their campus. The following section documents the example of the timing for a seven-year tenure clock review cycle. Please note that all research assistant professors should undergo a unit review at three years; the timing of the comprehensive university-based review will vary by school/college, and will be consistent with the time to tenure track assistant professor review.*

### **Research Assistant Professor**

The University has established a mandatory review policy for the rank of Research Assistant Professor.

The first period of appointment will be three years. During the faculty member's third year, the appointing unit will perform a review. Based on the results of the third-year review, the unit may determine that any of the three possible outcomes listed below are appropriate. Note that if the unit determines that the candidate is not yet qualified for promotion, but is making sufficient progress to remain in rank (outcome #2), the unit does not need to submit a plan to UMOR at the third-year review period.

When a Research Assistant Professor has been in rank for five years without promotion, the appointing unit must conduct a comprehensive review during his/her sixth year to determine his/her eligibility for promotion or continuation in rank. As part of this review, the unit must compile a casebook that is equivalent with the unit's procedures for promotion of tenure track instructional faculty. The results of this review will then be submitted to UMOR and the relevant Provost's Office for review and a decision.

If the Research Assistant Professor also holds a tenure-track position in a School or College with a tenure probationary period other than six years in length, the appointing unit for the research appointment may ask UMOR and the relevant Provost's Office to change the length of the review period for the research appointment to the same length as the faculty member's tenure probationary period.

There are three possible outcomes of the third-year and sixth-year reviews, contingent on approval by the designated authority, where applicable. The possible outcomes are described below:

1. Contingent on approval from the designated authority, the appointing unit may promote the faculty member to Research Associate Professor or Associate Research Scientist.
2. The unit may determine that the candidate is not currently qualified for promotion but is making sufficient progress toward successfully meeting the criteria for promotion to remain in the Research Professor Track as a Research Assistant Professor.
3. The unit may decide that the candidate is not presently qualified for promotion and that his/her performance to-date is insufficient to justify continuing an appointment on either research faculty track. The unit may appoint him/her to an appropriate staff position or terminate the candidate's employment as described below.

For Research Assistant Professors who are reappointed after the third-year review, the subsequent review will take place in the sixth year, as previously stated.

If, after the sixth-year review the unit recommends the candidate for a continued appointment in the Research Assistant Professor rank, the unit will prepare a professional development plan that will outline what steps, if any, the candidate and the unit will take to help the candidate continue to develop toward meeting the criteria for promotion at his/her subsequent review. The unit will propose a time for the subsequent review as part of this development plan. The appointing unit, contingent on approval by UMOR and the relevant Provost's Office, will decide the date of the subsequent review. The appointing unit will include the development plan in its request to UMOR and the relevant Provost's Office to reappoint the candidate.

If, at the three-year review, the unit recommends that the candidate be transferred to the Research Scientist Track, the candidate may be appointed as an Assistant Research Scientist. Nonetheless, the candidate will still undergo the mandatory sixth-year review based on the original appointment date (i.e., after five years from having been appointed as an Research Assistant Professor).

If the appointing unit decides the candidate is not qualified for promotion or continuation, the unit has two options, as described below. In each case, the Dean or Director of the appointing unit must approve the decision.

1. If the unit wants to continue to employ the candidate, the unit may appoint him/her to an appropriate staff position.
2. If the unit decides to terminate the candidate, it must provide appropriate notice to him/her of this decision. The unit must notify the faculty member at least 90 days before the date on which the unit will terminate his/her appointment or up to or no longer than one year before the date of termination.

Recommendations for continuation as a Research Assistant Professor, or promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor, require the consent of the Vice President for Research and the approval of the relevant Provost. In cases where the Vice President for Research does not consent to the continuation or promotion, the VPR will communicate with the relevant Provost about the case. Transfer to the Research Scientist Track with promotion to the rank of Associate Research Scientist, is contingent on the approval of the Vice President for Research.

To ensure newly appointed Research Assistant Professors are aware of this mandatory review policy, UMOR requires the appointing unit to include a signed MOU that includes a statement about this policy as part of the appointment documentation.

### **Research Associate Professor**

There is no limit to the amount of time a Research Associate Professor can remain in rank. An evaluation for promotion to Research Professor may be conducted at any time after the first three years in rank. A formal review for promotion may be requested by the candidate on six-year cycles. This review should be conducted with the same process and in parallel with promotion reviews of tenure track instructional faculty.

Promotion to Research Professor is contingent on the consent of the Vice President for Research and the subsequent approval of the relevant Provost. In cases where the Vice President for Research does not consent to the promotion, the VPR will communicate with the relevant Provost about the case.

### **13. Appointment Date Calculations**

For time-in-rank limits, mandatory review cycles and promotions, appointment dates are determined from the hire date as follows:

- For hire dates between September 1 and December 31, for the purposes mentioned above, the University considers the appointment begin date to be September 1 of the calendar year during which the faculty member is appointed.
- For hire dates between January 1 and August 31, for the purposes mentioned above, the University considers the appointment begin date to be September 1 of the calendar year during which the faculty member is appointed.

Exception: If a school/college has adopted a fiscal year appointment schedule, the actual appointment start date should be used to calculate the time-to-promotion review for faculty in the research professor track.

### **14. Movement Between the Research Scientist Track and the Research Professor Track**

The general criteria and procedures for movement between the Research Scientist Track and the Research Professor Track within each eligible rank are summarized here because of their importance.

#### **Research Investigator to Research Assistant Professor**

The Vice President for Research has established a **four-year** maximum time-in-rank policy for the rank of Research Investigator. After four years without promotion, the appointing unit must move a Research Investigator out of the rank.

After two years at the rank of the Research Investigator, the unit may review the faculty member to consider whether he/she has met the criteria for transfer to the Research Professor Track with a promotion to Research Assistant Professor. The unit must conduct this review using the same process as when it reviews tenure track instructional faculty for promotion.

#### **Assistant Research Scientist to Research Assistant Professor or Research Associate Professor**

At any time during the first six years of an Assistant Research Scientist's appointment, if the unit decides that the candidate has met the criteria for transfer to the Research Professor Track as a Research Assistant Professor, the unit may transfer the candidate to this rank, following unit procedures. However, such a transfer does not affect the timing of the appointing unit's full review of the candidate for continuation or promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor, which will occur during the faculty member's sixth year based on his/her original appointment date as an Assistant Research Scientist. Continuation of the appointment as a Research Assistant Professor beyond the sixth year is contingent on the approval of UMOR and the relevant Provost's Office.

If, based on the review, the unit decides that the Assistant Research Scientist has met the criteria for promotion to Research Associate Professor; the unit may recommend promotion to this level. This review should be conducted following the same process and, where applicable, in the same time frame as reviews for promotion of tenure track instructional faculty.

Recommendation for promotion to Research Associate Professor by the unit will be jointly reviewed by UMOR and the relevant Provost's Office. Promotion to Research Associate Professor requires the review and consent of the Vice President for Research and the subsequent approval of the relevant Provost. In cases where the Vice President for Research does not consent to the promotion, the VPR will communicate with the relevant Provost about the case.

#### **Associate Research Scientist to Research Associate Professor or Research Professor**

An Associate Research Scientist can remain in rank indefinitely. An evaluation for promotion to Research Scientist may be conducted at any time after the first three years in rank. A formal review for promotion may be requested by the candidate on six-year cycles. Candidates recommended for promotion to Research Scientist by the unit must be approved by UMOR.

If, during an evaluation for promotion to Research Scientist, the unit decides that the candidate has met the criteria for transfer to the Research Professor Track as a Research Associate Professor, the transfer from the Research Scientist Track to the Research Professor Track may be considered. This review should be conducted with the same process and in parallel with promotion reviews of tenure track instructional faculty.

Promotion to Research Associate Professor or Research Professor requires the consent of the Vice President for Research and the approval of the relevant Provost. In cases where the Vice President for Research does not consent to the promotion, the VPR will communicate with the relevant Provost about the case.

#### **Research Scientist to Research Associate Professor or Research Professor**

A Research Scientist can remain in rank indefinitely. An evaluation for promotion to Research Professor may be conducted at any time after the first three years in rank at the request of the candidate. A formal review for promotion may be requested by the candidate on six-year cycles. This review should be conducted with the same process and in parallel with promotion reviews of tenure track instructional faculty.

Promotion to Research Associate Professor or Research Professor requires the consent of the Vice President for Research and the subsequent approval of the relevant Provost. In cases where the Vice President for Research does not consent to the promotion, the VPR will communicate with the relevant Provost about the case.

#### **Research Assistant Professor to Assistant Research Scientist or Associate Research Scientist**

If, within the six years of the Research Assistant Professor appointment, the unit decides that the candidate is better suited for the Research Scientist Track, the unit may transfer the person from the Research Professor Track to the Research Scientist Track at the rank of Assistant Research Scientist. However, the appointing unit must perform a full review for continuation or promotion to the rank of Associate Research Scientist during the sixth year based on the original appointment date as a Research Assistant Professor. Continuation of the appointment as an Assistant Research Scientist beyond the sixth year is contingent on approval by UMOR.

Alternatively, a Research Assistant Professor may be promoted to Associate Research Scientist if the candidate meets the qualifications for that title. Promotion to Associate Research Scientist is subject to approval by the Vice President for Research.

#### **Research Associate Professor to Research Scientist**

A Research Associate Professor can remain in rank indefinitely. An evaluation for promotion to Research Professor may be conducted at any time after the first three years in rank. A formal review for promotion may be requested by the candidate on six-year cycles. This review should be conducted with the same process and in parallel with promotion reviews of tenure track instructional faculty.

The candidate may request to be considered for promotion to a Research Scientist. An evaluation for appointment to Research Scientist may be conducted at any time after the first three years in rank. A formal review for such a change of appointment may be requested by the candidate on six-year cycles. Recommendation for promotion to Research Scientist must be approved by the Vice President for Research.

### **15. Special Cases**

#### **Dry Research Faculty Appointments**

Units may appoint a faculty member to a Research Professor Track or Research Scientist Track dry appointment (0% effort on all research faculty appointments) for up to three years without review. Subsequently, the School, College, or unit must determine whether the connection of the faculty member to the appointing unit justifies the renewal of the dry appointment. The unit must do this type of determination at least every three years.

#### **Adjunct Research Faculty Appointments**

Adjunct research faculty appointments are used when an individual's primary employment responsibilities lie outside the University. An adjunct faculty appointment indicates that the individual is working for a limited, part-time portion of his/her work effort on research. Appointing units may offer adjunct appointments at any research faculty rank, consistent with the person's professional qualifications as specified in this document. Adjunct appointments are for one year or less in duration.

#### **Visiting Research Faculty Appointments**

Visiting research faculty appointments are for scholars visiting the University for a predetermined time (one year or less) to conduct research. Typically such an individual holds his/her primary appointment at another academic/research institution, and the appointing unit expects him/her to return to that position. Appointing

units may offer visiting research faculty appointments at any research faculty rank, consistent with the person’s professional qualifications as specified in this document.

**16. Bridging Support for Research Faculty**

UMOR manages a central, cost-shared, “bridging support” program for research faculty on the Ann Arbor campus. On the Dearborn and Flint campuses, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for maintaining an equivalent program.

Bridging support addresses the need for salary and fringe benefit support for research faculty who experience a temporary loss in external (sponsored) funding due to factors beyond their control. The duration of support is determined by both the rank of the research faculty member and their years of service in a bridging eligible rank. Funding eligibility is detailed below. The bridging program requires a minimum of a dollar-for-dollar match from the appointing unit. This program does not cover severance pay or terminal leaves for research faculty whose appointments at the University are ending.

Each unit that appoints research faculty is responsible for developing, administering, and funding **its** portion of the bridging support program for its research faculty. Bridging fund programs administered by the units must adhere, at a minimum, to the following guidelines:

**Eligibility**

<b>Rank</b> Years of Service*	<b>Funding Eligibility</b> (Salary and benefits in any five-year period)
<b>Research Investigator</b>	Not eligible
<b>Assistant, Associate &amp; Research Scientist and Research Assistant Professor</b>	
Less than 3 years of service	Not eligible
3-5 years of service	Up to 2 months of salary & benefits
5-10 years of service	Up to 3 months of salary & benefits
10+ years of service	Up to 6 months of salary & benefits
<b>Research Associate Professor and Research Professor</b>	
Less than 3 years of service	Up to 6 months salary & benefits
3 or more years of service	Up to 12 months salary & benefits

\* Includes all years above the rank of Research Investigator

Research faculty in the above ranks who hold joint research and non-tenured faculty appointments in any faculty track are eligible for bridging on the research appointment. Part-time research faculty in these ranks are eligible for bridging based on their reduced effort if they have met the years of service requirement.

## Ineligible Faculty

- Research faculty who also hold a tenured instructional track appointment are not eligible for bridge funding.
- The Institute for Social Research has a separate bridge funding program that meets or exceeds the requirements specified above. For this reason, research faculty appointed in ISR are not eligible for bridge funding through UMOR.
- Research faculty with 0% (dry) appointments are not eligible for bridge funding.

## Evaluation Criteria

Criteria used in the evaluation of bridging support requests include:

- The quality and significance of the researcher's work;
- The researcher's past experience in obtaining external support for his/her work;
- The researcher's potential for obtaining such support in the future;
- Evidence that the applicant has a grant application which is expected to be funded in the near future (1-6 months) by an external agency;
- Evidence that the researcher's work is in keeping with unit and institutional priorities; and
- A statement by the applicant's appointing unit as to the applicant's continued employment.

Instructions for applying for bridging support can be found at [http://orsp.umich.edu/funding/UM\\_Sources/OVPR.html](http://orsp.umich.edu/funding/UM_Sources/OVPR.html).

## 17. Reduction-in-Force

Research faculty reduction-in-force (RIF, layoff) actions are governed by Standard Practice Guide (SPG) 201.72 – "Reduction-in-Force." In addition to the requirements established by SPG 201.72, the joint approval of UMOR and the Office of Academic Human Resources (AHR) is required before a unit may issue a RIF notification to a research faculty member. The appointing unit must submit the RIF proposal to UMOR, which will work jointly with AHR to review the proposal. All proposed RIF actions should be submitted to UMOR with sufficient lead-time to allow for the appropriate coordinated review. Additional requirements are provided below:

- For all research faculty, appointing units must provide a minimum notice of 90 days before a RIF takes effect.
- For RIF proposals that would affect research faculty with less than three years of service, the appointing unit must provide substantial documentation of why the unit is unable to fulfill its original three-year commitment.
- Reduction of research faculty will be determined at the research group level. The order of reduction will begin with the research faculty member with the least University service, except that the University may retain research faculty, irrespective of service, who possess the necessary skills, knowledge, and abilities to perform the available work which are not possessed to the same degree by other research faculty members in the same research group.
- At a minimum, appointing units should provide the information on the list below in an RIF proposal:
  - Offer letter and hiring Memorandum of Understanding (MOU);
  - Funding history;
  - Status of all current sources of funds;
  - Role (PI or Co-PI) on active grants, term of award and funding commitment;
  - Role (PI or Co-PI), funding level and probability of success on all pending grants; and

- Other known pending grants with support for research faculty member.

## 18. Research Faculty Governance

Faculty governance rights and privileges for research faculty are determined at the level of the School, College, or unit, in accordance with the policy and procedures of the School or College, or unit.

### APPENDICES

Sections 1-18 of this document serve as the University's base guidelines for research faculty appointments and promotions in both the **Research Scientist Track and Research Professor Track**. Appointing units may adopt more restrictive criteria. When the approved unit specific guidelines (see appendices) include more restrictive criteria, these criteria govern appointments and promotions made in the unit.

#### Unit Specific Procedures For Appointments And Promotions

*Regent's Bylaw 5.24 allows an academic or research unit to appoint research faculty if they have adopted policies to authorize such appointments in accordance with the bylaws of that unit and have been approved by the Vice President for Research and relevant Provost.*

*This section is for the unit specific procedures governing appointments and promotions of research faculty. These should be conducted with the same process and in parallel with appointment/promotion reviews of tenure track instructional faculty.*

*If an academic or research unit has been previously approved to appoint research faculty, but they have not updated their guidelines to comply with current policy, the University's base guidelines will govern their appointments*

#### Summary of changes posted on Nov. 15, 2013

Note: New sections that have been added change the numbering of sections from the previous version of these guidelines. The changes below reflect the new numbering.

- Section 3 – Resources commitments to create a new research faculty position and appointment structure(s)
  - Resource Commitment – revised and clarified the resource commitments required to establish a new research faculty position.
  - Appointment Structure – provides clarifying information on research faculty appointments to be established consistent with the review/term-limit requirements.
  - Special Case – Clarification on when term-limited appointments may be considered.
- Section 4 – Notice of Non-Reappointment  
New section to clarify the notice requirements in situations of non-reappointment.
- Section 6 – Extension of time to review for childbearing or dependent care responsibilities.  
Revised to align with SPG210.92.
- Section 10 – Expectations Regarding Appointments and Promotions  
Relocated for consistency of information flow; was previously at the end of the document.

- Section 12 – Mandatory Review Cycles for the Research Professor Track  
Introductory paragraph added to clarify alignment of review cycles to parallel the school/college review cycle (tenure clock) for tenure track instructional faculty.
- Section 13 – Appointment Date Calculation  
New information on how to calculate the time-to-promotion review if the school/college has adopted a fiscal year appointment schedule.
- Section 17 – Reduction-in-Force  
New information to clarify that when reductions are necessary, they will be determined by the home research group.