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1. **INTRODUCTION**

Promotions for Research Faculty in the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts are governed by the College policy on Research Faculty Promotions and adhere to the UMOR promotion process

(<http://research.umich.edu/appointments-promotions>**).** Packages for promotions should be addressed to the College Executive Committee.

**2. PRINCIPLES**

Every person hired by a department and/or program in LSA is hired with the hope that he/she will be promoted. The College procedures for promotion are intended to ensure a fair process for all candidates. Nevertheless, promotion is an earned privilege, not a right. (Term limited appointments are not part of the promotion process.)

The University has adopted a time-in-rank (six years) and mandatory review (at three years) policy. Units in which the candidate holds an appointment, the College, and the University all have an important role in reviews.

* Assistant level: Mandatory third year reviews for Assistant Research Scientists are handled at the unit level but not reviewed by the College.
* Associate levels through Research Professor: An evaluation for promotion 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 a six-year cycle. Other research faculty can remain in rank indefinitely.

Promotion for all research faculty should be granted only to candidates who have demonstrated excellence in research and if in the Research Professor track a record of non-didactic teaching and appropriate service. Excellent research should have a demonstrable impact on the area of study to which it is meant to contribute and should provide evidence for a strong presumption of future distinction. The only overriding criteria for granting or not granting promotion are the quality, quantity, and impact of the candidate’s research and if appropriate the non-didactic teaching, and appropriate service.

* Each candidate for promotion will be reviewed by the College Executive Committee.
* Those who participate in the review process bear a high level of accountability and responsibility to both the University and the candidate. At the unit level, chairs/directors (or their designates) bear primary responsibility for all procedural aspects of this decision making. They must provide the leadership necessary to produce an assessment based on a thorough, critical reading of the candidate’s work, and a fully informed discussion of that work and all other aspects of the candidate’s career. It is also their responsibility to insure that an accurate and full representation of the contents of these discussions is provided to College committees.
* Those who work in the disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary area(s) of the candidate, or with the same methods, are best able to judge the substantive value of the candidate’s work.
* Candidates are entitled to a procedurally correct review:
	+ The promotion process as outlined by the College and the unit and conveyed to the candidate has been followed;
	+ Unit review panels, decision making bodies, and the College Divisional Evaluation Committee have given a thorough, critical reading to the candidate’s work and have engaged seriously with it in their discussion;
	+ Colleagues’ discussion of the candidate’s work has been conducted in professional terms; and
	+ The review panel is specific to each faculty member and includes at least one member broadly conversant with the candidate’s field and/or methodology.
* Criteria for promotion must be as transparent as possible and must be made known to the candidate at the time of appointment.
	+ These criteria must take into account the changing nature of scholarship, including interdisciplinary work and electronic publication. The criteria must enunciate clearly the importance of research and if appropriate non-didactic teaching and appropriate service. It must also define procedurally critical terms (e.g., “arm’s length” assessment).
	+ Units must develop written criteria that are consistent with those of the College and the University and address disciplinary and interdisciplinary standards.
	+ Units must publish internally a clear set of deadlines relative to promotion and a list of responsibilities on the part of the candidate with regard to the process.
	+ These criteria, deadlines, and a list of candidates’ responsibilities must be available in writing to all new appointees on arrival and must be provided at several intervals.
	+ It should be clear which members of the faculty are eligible to vote on appointment and promotion for Research Faculty.

The procedures described below are intended to ensure that every candidate is considered thoroughly, fairly, and according to correct procedures at the College level. The College therefore requests that units follow the guidelines set forth in this document scrupulously.

**3. OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS**

Candidates are reviewed for promotion no later than their sixth year in rank in LSA.

**Recommended Timetable for a Promotion Recommendation in the Sixth Year:**

* **Early February of the 5th Year** – Conversations between the chair/director and the candidate take place to review the entire process. If applicable, handling of selection of which LSA Divisional Evaluation Committee (DEC) will review the casebook is discussed at this time. If DEC selected differs from unit’s assigned division and there is documentation (e.g., an email), please retain that in the unit files.
* **Early April** – The unit selects the candidate’s review panel in accordance with its by-laws (either within the unit or jointly with another unit) and the candidate and unit develop a list with a minimum of 12 names of external reviewers. See Section 4 – Preparing for the Review Process.
* **April-May** – The chair/director, in consultation with members of the Review Panel (RP), select external reviewers. The chair/director begins to contact reviewers informally to determine their availability (see below for detailed instructions).
* **Early June** – The candidate provides the unit with his/her CV, non-didactic teaching statement (if on the research professor track), research statement, and copies of scholarship.
* **June** – The chair/director sends the candidate’s materials to external reviewers with an early September deadline for receipt of letters.
* **Early September to early October** – The Review Panel (RP) reviews the case and prepares its preliminary report. The preliminary report is given to the candidate, allowing two weeks for a written response from the candidate. The final RP report is updated based on the written response from the candidate if necessary.
* **Mid-October to early November** – The faculty voting body reviews the final RP report and the candidate’s response and votes. The chair/director then composes the cover letter and assures proper assembly of the dossier to be submitted to the College.
* **Mid-December** – Deadline for units to submit research promotion casebooks to the College.
* **Mid-February** – Deadline for College decisions on Research Professor Track promotions to be submitted to the Provost and UMOR.
* **Mid-May** – Final decision by the Regents on research professor track promotion cases are made.
* **Early June** – Final decisions by UMOR on research scientist track promotions are announced on or before this date.

For current dates see the [LSA Promotion Calendar](http://lsa.umich.edu/lsa/faculty-staff/academic-affairs/policies-and-procedures/tenured-and-tenure-track-faculty/promotions.html).

**Setting the clock** – 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 purpose 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 purpose mentioned above, the University considers the appointment begin date to be September 1 of the calendar year during which the faculty member is appointed

**Request for Delay of Promotion Review** – Under certain circumstances assistant research scientists may request approval to delay of their promotion review as an exception to the six-year rule. Junior research faculty who add children to their households, experience other care-giving demands, or experience personal illness during the pre-promotion years may request an exclusion of one or two years resulting in a delay of the promotion review up to a maximum of two years.

If postponement of the assistant research scientist review is being contemplated **the following should be kept in mind**:

* The postponement must be requested by the candidate within one year of the event and endorsed by the unit;
* The unit must request the postponement prior to the date at which the promotion review process would otherwise have begun;
* The request for postponement may not be based on events that occur during the final year of the pre-promotion period; and
* Regardless of the combination of circumstances or of the policy under which the promotion review is delayed, the maximum time that may be excluded is two years.

Whenever a postponement of the review process is granted, it is granted with the clear expectation that the eventual evaluation process will not involve anychange in the standards or criteria applied for promotion review. Thus, the postponement of the review is granted in recognition that there has been time lost to the candidate that could only be compensated for by postponing the review.

It is very important that all individuals and committees participating in promotion reviews understand that any individual who has received a postponement of the review must be held to the same standard – and not to a higher or a more stringent standard – to which we hold candidates who do not receive postponement of the promotion review.

**Early Promotion** – Candidates who have already demonstrated excellence may be reviewed prior to the sixth year. However, assistant research scientists recommended for promotion who are not reviewed favorably by the College Executive Committee will be asked to provide a plan for making satisfactory progress for promotion. Additional requests for review for promotion must include external letters received in the last two years. If an early review is being considered for a research faculty member, please contact the appropriate Divisional Associate Dean.

**4. PREPARING FOR THE REVIEW PROCESS**

Units must share these guidelines with research-track candidates and produce a clear account of deadlines relative to promotion as well as a list of responsibilities on the part of the candidate regarding the process.

**External Reviewers List** – It is important that the external reviewer names are independently put forward by the unit and the candidate. The unit should consult with faculty in the field for possible reviewer names. The College requires at least **six** external evaluations and at least **five** of the six must come from “arm’s length” reviewers. For promotion to Research Associate Professor and Research Professor **at least two of the five** must be **selected only by the unit**.

In early April of the academic year preceding the review, a list of 8-10 possible external reviewers should be prepared (see Section 5 – Written Evaluations). Recommendations for external reviewers must come from both the candidate and the unit.

In addition, the candidate may provide the unit with:

* the names of scholars who, in the candidate’s view, are unsuitable to evaluate his or her work due to conflict of interest or specific scholarly competition (see below); and/or
* the names of his/her dissertation and/or post-doctoral fellowship supervisors since such persons can sometimes usefully contextualize the work.

 **To be considered at arm’s length, a potential reviewer should meet these requirements:**

* All external reviewers must hold a rank equivalent to the candidate’s proposed promotional rank or higher. External reviewers at the rank of Professor, Research Professor, or Research Scientist are preferred. If circumstances necessitate letters from out-of-rank reviewers, those should be explained. Note that these will not be considered to be at arm’s length.
* Only reviewers who are currently or were at some point in their career appointed as a tenure track professor, research track professor, or research scientist track professor may review promotion casebooks for research track faculty; i.e.:
* External reviewers who are tenured faculty can review all promotion casebooks for the Instructional tenure track and Research Professor track.
* External reviewers who are Research Professor track faculty can only review promotion casebooks for the Research Professor track.
* Teachers, advisors, mentors, and current faculty colleagues are not at arm’s length.
* Co-authors, major research collaborators, and/or former faculty colleagues are also not at arm’s length unless the most recent association occurred over 10 years prior to the effective date of the promotion. In some disciplines (e.g., experimental high physics) where collaborations are quite large (i.e., hundreds of people), this criterion may be relaxed.
* When both an outside reviewer and the candidate for promotion are members of the same large cooperative/research group that publishes abstracts and manuscripts with an expanded number of co-authors, the outside reviewer may 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 the chair/director to provide a statement noting the absence of a direct collaboration.
* Letters from persons who have served on a candidate’s thesis or dissertation committee are not at arm’s length. While these kinds of letters may be especially helpful (because the letter writers can be presumed to have a good sense of both the candidate and the work), it is also true that their own reputations are involved in the work being evaluated. If such letters are included, they must be in addition to the minimum requirement of five arm’s length letters.
* Non-academic reviewers (e.g., employed at the NIH or a major research institute) may be included in the required five arm's length letters but only if it is stated that, for those individuals who do not typically hold an academic title, their rank is equivalent or higher than the research track rank for which the candidate is being considered.
* The external reviewer may not be a close personal friend or someone with whom the candidate has a past or ongoing romantic, sexual, or familial relationship.

**Conflict of Interest/Scholarly Competition with External Reviewers** – The candidate should indicate to the chair/director the names of any figures in the field that he/she thinks unsuitable to assess his/her work by reason of conflict of interest or specific scholarly competition and should state the basis by which these persons are inappropriate. Intellectual disagreements alone are not grounds for excluding someone from the list of suitable external reviewers. In cases of those appropriately identified as having a conflict of interest, such persons will not be asked to provide external assessments.

If this list includes internal colleagues who might otherwise serve on the Review Panel or the decision-making body, if this list contains more than five names, or if the candidate has any questions, please contact the appropriate Associate Dean.

**Chair/Director Guidance to Candidate on Preparing Quality Documents for the Casebook** – The chair/director or designee should explain to the candidate the ingredients of good research and, if appropriate, non-didactic teaching statements. It is helpful, but not necessary, to provide the candidate with examples of research statements and non-didactic teaching statements from previously successful cases.

**Some additional recommendations include:**

* Remind the candidate to address a general intellectual audience.
* Suggest individuals to whom the candidate might show drafts of his/her statements.
* For research professor track promotions, potentially relevant topics for **the non-didactic teaching statement** include:
	+ main objectives at each level of instruction (including mentorships),
	+ genesis of the candidate’s pedagogical innovations, and
	+ evolution of non-didactic teaching style.
* Potentially relevant topics for **the research statement** include:
	+ authorship position (describe what that means in your field);
	+ how the research program fits together,
	+ false starts in procurement of funding or execution of the research program,
	+ how the dissertation was revised into a monograph,
	+ exact role(s) in collaborative work, and
	+ plans for future research.

**Candidate’s Casebook Documents** – Please notify the candidate in writing (*at least two months before the relevant deadline*) of his/her informational responsibilities. In preparation for the external review, in early June of the academic year preceding the review, the candidate must provide the unit with copies of:

* a current curriculum vitae (**check the accuracy, completeness, and timeliness** of the information, including the candidate’s actual HR title(s), status of publications, grant activity date, and status, etc.).
* a research statement (five pages maximum),
* a non-didactic teaching statement (research professor track only), and
* copies of his/her written work, including publications accepted but not yet in press.
	+ It is helpful for the candidate to provide a copy of all of his/her publications. The chair/director, in consultation with the candidate, should select recent and significant works to send to the reviewers and keep the rest on hand in case they should be needed.

**5. WRITTEN EVALUATIONS**

**EXTERNAL**

Once a unit initiates the process of requesting external letters for promotion, the review process must continue and result in a recommendation from the unit to the College for or against promotion.

**How to Select Reviewers** – Once a list of potential external reviewers has been prepared, the chair/director in consultation with members of the Review Panel selects which external reviewers to approach. For research professor track promotions at least two **arm’s length** external reviewers must have been selected only by the unit.

The Divisional Evaluation Committee and the College Executive Committee read these evaluations extremely carefully. In judging an external letter, committee members place as much weight on the credibility of the letter’s author as on the volume of praise. Is the author at arm’s length from the candidate? Does the author show clear evidence of having read the candidate’s work?

Having reviewers who are outside the candidate’s immediate subfield can be very helpful for the evaluation of the case. Committees and individuals reviewing the case above the unit level will give more credence to a set of letters which are viewed as being relatively broad in its collective expertise and able to provide a disinterested perspective on the candidate’s scholarship.

**The following should be kept in mind when making the selection** **of external reviewers:**

* All external reviewers must hold a rank equivalent to the candidate’s proposed promotional rank or higher. If the reviewer is not an academic or research track faculty member , he or she must hold a rank of equivalent stature. Reviewers at the rank of research professor or professors with tenure generally carry more weight with the Divisional Evaluation and Executive Committees. In addition, please include the following on the external reviewers list (**Appdx 5**):
	+ the rationale for choosing a non-academic reviewer,
	+ his/her current title and how that title equates to the research track rank for which the candidate is being considered, and
	+ if he/she has never held an appointment at the rank of professor, research professor, or research scientist, then he/she is not an arm’s length reviewer.
* If circumstances arise in which a reviewer does not meet the rank criteria, this must be discussed in advance with the relevant Associate Dean and should be explained by the chair/director in the external reviewers list.
* The College requires at least six external evaluations. At least five of these must come from “arm’s length” reviewers and for research professor track promotions **at least two of the five** must have been selected only by the unit. Units are encouraged to seek more than five arm’s length letters.
* If the candidate publishes or seeks grants collaboratively, then it may be useful to supplement the arm’s length letters with a letter or two from individuals who can describe from experience the role(s) of the candidate in his or her collaborations. In the letters soliciting assessments from such individuals, please ask specifically for such information (see **Appdx. 2**).

**INTERNAL**

* Letters should also be solicited from every UM program in which the candidate has a joint appointment including courtesy (dry) appointments. If the candidate is NOT being promoted in those units, the letter should detail the reasons behind this decision and indicate when the candidate is likely to be reviewed for promotion.
* At the candidate’s request, letters may also be solicited from internal units where the candidate holds an Additional Appointment and their research, non-didactic teaching (if relevant), and/or service plays a significant role in that unit. These letters should describe the role(s) the candidate plays in that unit, how well he/she performs the role(s), and whether or not the unit plans to promote the candidate (pending promotion in the primary unit(s)).
* “Unsolicited” letters are not to be included in the file. The chair/director may incorporate the feedback from those letters into the cover letter.

**How to Approach Reviewers** – The initial approach to potential external reviewers may be via an email message from the chair/director of the unit or the chair of the Review Panel (RP).

* The standard letter to external reviewers in **Appdx. 2** must be included as an attachment to the email message in order to provide potential reviewers with a sense of what is required in the external review.
* The email request for a review should (a) detail when the reviewer can expect to receive the candidate’s materials and (b) establish a deadline by which the external reviewer’s letter is due.
* In the event that the potential reviewer agrees to provide the review, a signed copy of the standard letter to external reviewers which includes the policy on confidentiality must be sent with the packet of review materials (see **Appdx. 2**). In the event that the potential reviewer does not agree, the date of the communication and the reasons for declining should be recorded.

Faculty should be informed by the chair/director to refrain from communicating with any reviewer concerning the candidate until after the review has been completed.

**Sending Materials to the Reviewers** – Each reviewer should be provided with copies of the candidate’s materials (i.e., CV, non-didactic teaching statement if relevant, research statement, and important publications).

**When deciding which publications should be included, please note the following**:

* Do not feel obliged to include every single entry on the curriculum vitae, but do include the candidate’s important publications and a good sampling of recent (including, if appropriate, unpublished) work. It is better to error on the inclusive side when defining important publications.
* Chairs/directors may wish to ask the candidate if he/she wants to exclude unpublished work from materials sent to close scholarly competitors. Close scholarly competitors includes persons funded by the same agencies for work on closely related projects, as well as persons who compete with the candidate for priority in publishing of findings from closely related research projects.
* Please send the candidate’s research statement as well.

**6. PROMOTION REVIEW PANEL**

By early Aprilof the academic year preceding the review, the unit must select a Review Panel (RP) or Joint Review Panel (JRP) according to the bylaws within the unit. The unit’s RP is responsible for preparing the preliminary and final RP Report.

**Members of the Review Panel –** The RP should include persons who are working in the same broadly construed subfield(s) and/or using the same methods as the candidate. Therefore, the unit must make every effort to assure an appropriate composition of the RP that is specific to each candidate being considered for promotion. **The following additional guidelines should be followed:**

* A single unit RP must include at least 3 faculty members. A quorum is a mixture of three (3) research scientists, research professors, and/or tenure track faculty above the rank of the candidate. The RP does not have to include members from units with dry appointments.
* At least one member of the RP must *not* be a member of the decision-making body unless the decision making body is all faculty in the unit(s)**.**
* The RP should be made up primarily of people who are not co-authors with the candidate.
* Exceptions to the requirement regarding expertise of the panel will be allowed for the rare occasions when a:
* field is new and/or under-populated in the unit and there are no other faculty working in the sub-field or
* a member of the sub-field is explicitly identified by the candidate as inappropriate and the relevant Associate Dean, in consultation with the chair/director, agrees.
* If there are problems constructing the RP, contact the relevant Associate Dean.
* The RP must not include any faculty who would encounter a conflict of interest in participating in the review of the candidate. Such a conflict of interest would occur in the event of a past or ongoing romantic, sexual, or familial relationship between a member of the faculty of the unit and the candidate. Faculty who have a conflict of interest must not participate in any element of the review process or be present in any discussion of the case.
* RP members should be aware that the identity of the members of the RP is a matter of public record and their names will be available to the candidate.

**7. PROMOTION REVIEW FOR RESEARCH FACULTY**

**WITH JOINT APPOINTMENTS**

A research-track faculty member holds a Joint Appointment if he/she holds any combination of regular instructional, research, or clinical instructional appointments, including appointments of 0% effort (sometimes called “dry” or “courtesy” appointments). These Joint Appointments may all be in LSA or one or more may be in another school, college, or research center:

* research-track appointments in two LSA units,
* a research-track appointment in one LSA unit and a non-tenure-track appointment in another LSA or non-LSA unit, or
* a tenure-track appointment in one LSA unit and a research-track appointment in another LSA or non-LSA unit (both with effort/funding).

LSA units should contact the relevant Divisional Associate Dean in early April to discuss the upcoming promotion and tenure consideration for a faculty member jointly appointed in a unit outside the College.

This section is intended to outline the procedures to be followed for faculty with joint research-track and tenure-track appointments.

**Research Faculty Appointment in One LSA Unit and a Tenure-Track Appointment in a Non-LSA Unit** – The following process should be followed:

* Standard College procedures will be followed for the LSA portion of the position.
* If a school or college outside of LSA does not have a Review Panel, the relevant Associate Dean will request, by May 1st of the academic year preceding the promotion review, that the appropriate non-LSA Dean appoint members to a Joint Review Panel (JRP). If the non-LSA Dean fails to respond within 60 days of the request, the promotion review will go forward with only LSA participants.

Occasionally, a non-LSA school/college and the LSA unit may be on a different time schedule for reaching a decision on tenure and promotion. When this occurs, the non-LSA school/college should provide LSA with its own assessment of the case. Throughout the process, the deans of all units in which the candidate holds a research-track appointment may be consulted for advice.

**8. PRELIMINARY REVIEW PANEL REPORT**

The Review Panel (RP) or Joint Review Panel (JRP) must prepare and then forward to the candidate a full and frank summary, to be referred to as the “Preliminary Report,” of what it sees as the strengths and weaknesses of all aspects of the record in relation to promotion (i.e., covering scholarship, non-didactic teaching, if appropriate, and service). The RP/JRP should provide a balanced review of the case avoiding advocacy.

Because this document is responded to by the candidate, and because both this document and that response play a crucial role in all the decision making that follows, it is essential that the Preliminary Report is balanced and frank.

Some general guidelines for the Preliminary Report follow:

* The report should be limited to 3-6 pages.
* The Preliminary Report must protect absolutely the identities of the external reviewers. It must not include any quotes directly from the letters of evaluation (even anonymously), and it must not include any markers that would enable the candidate to identify the reviewers.
* The Preliminary Report should **not** make a recommendation for or against promotion.
* The focus of the report should be on assessment and should convey important strengths and weaknesses of the case as seen by both the outside reviewers and by the members of the panel. It is not appropriate for the RP to substitute completely its own judgment for that of the outside evaluators of the research.
* While is it not necessary to search for negatives or exaggerate minor negative points, panel members should think carefully before downplaying or minimizing important negative aspects of the record. In general, it is better for the panel to refute or provide the argument against a negative comment rather than to simply dismiss the matter. Downplaying negative issues may prevent the candidate from having the opportunity to respond to them and may result in the case arriving at the College without the negative elements having been addressed at all. Such issues invariably surface in the Divisional Evaluation Committee review.
* Panel members should also be aware of the specific role of the RP, which is to evaluate the candidate’s record. The Preliminary Report is not the place to propose a new line of research the candidate should have pursued, unless these concerns are serious enough to result in a negative recommendation (e.g., the candidate’s research program has failed to keep up with the field, etc.).
* Neither the chair/director nor the RP may consult with the unit decision-making body prior to receiving the response from the candidate about the Preliminary Report.
* Because of the procedural importance of the Preliminary Report in the process, it is within the overall procedural responsibility of the chair/director to ensure that this report is balanced before it goes to the candidate. In some cases this may require consultation between the chair/director and the RP or even the requirement of revisions that add balance.

The chair/director transmits the Preliminary Report to the candidate with the appropriate cover letter (see template in **Appdx. 4**). If the candidate holds more than one research track appointment, the relevant chairs/directors should coordinate the transmission of the Preliminary Report.

1. **CANDIDATE’S RIGHT OF RESPONSE AND THE FINAL REVIEW PANEL/JOINT REVIEW PANEL REPORT**

Once the candidate receives the Preliminary Report from the chair/director, the candidate must be given **two weeks** to respond in writing to the Preliminary Report.

**Final Report** – When the candidate’s response has been received, the RP/JRP determines whether there are any corrections or amendments necessary based on the candidate’s response, makes a decision on its recommendation for or against promotion, and prepares the final report.

* All changes incorporated into the Final Report that differ from the Preliminary Report should be clearly marked (underlined or in **bold**). If the Preliminary Report has not been modified after receiving the candidate’s response, except for inclusion of the recommendation for or against promotion, this should be explicitly noted on the final report.
* The candidate is to respond only to the Preliminary Report – not to the Final Report.
* The Preliminary Report, the Candidate’s Response, and the Final Report should all be provided to the unit’s decision making body before any actions regarding promotion recommendations are taken.
* If the candidate chooses not to respond, a written statement to that effect should be obtained from the candidate.
* In the event that negative elements that did not appear in the Preliminary Report emerge in the course of the discussion of the decision making body and are relevant to a negative vote by the unit, the candidate must be informed of those new elements in a letter from the chair/director and be given one week to respond in writing. This response will be forwarded to the College as part of the promotion document.

The Preliminary Report, the Candidate’s Response, and the Final Report shall be forwarded to the College as part of the promotional dossier.

**10. DECISION MAKING IN THE UNIT**

At least 8 members of the voting faculty made up of Associate Research Scientists, Research Scientists, Research Associate Professors, Research Professors and/or Tenure Track Faculty must participate in the decision to promote with the sole exception of departments and programs in which there are not eight faculty members on active status on campus. In that case, the full complement of eligible faculty not on leave must participate. The chair or director may chair the voting body or group, participate in the discussion, and vote on the case, if that is consistent with departmental rules of governance and practice.

There are two models for unit decision making with respect to promotion. The decision making body can be defined according to either model in accordance with the unit by-laws or rules of governance.

* According to the first model, the final vote on whether or not to recommend promotion involves all voting members of the unit.
* When all faculty members in a unit who are either on campus or available by telephone conference participate in the final decision about promotion, **a positive vote of at least 2/3 of those present at the meeting and eligible to vote shall constitute a positive recommendation. A cast vote of “abstain” shall count as a negative vote.** The vote shall be taken by secret ballot and shall be reported to the College.
* According to the second model, the final vote is taken by a subset of all the eligible voting faculty members in the unit. The subset includes at least eight individuals.
* Where a decision making body smaller than the entire voting faculty of the unit makes a recommendation regarding promotion to the College **a positive vote, taken by secret ballot, of at least 2/3 of the body’s members will constitute a positive recommendation. A cast vote of “abstain” shall count as a negative vote.** The vote shall be reported to the College.

The participating members in either model should not include any faculty who would encounter a conflict of interest in participating in the review of the candidate (see Section 4). The Review Panel (RP) or the Joint Review Panel (JRP) should appear before the decision making body to present the results of its deliberations.

**In the case of joint appointments in two LSA units,** each unit must invite the JRP to appear before, and answer questions from, the decision making body within the unit. Each unit makes its own decision, independently of the decision made by the other unit.If the units agree on whether or not to recommend promotion, then a single file is sent to the College. If the units disagree, the case is forwarded to the College with cover letters from the chairs/directors of both units.

**11. CHAIR/DIRECTOR COVER LETTER**

The chair/director cover letter is a crucially important part of the casebook. It should be written after all decision making at the unit level is completed. The primary purpose of this letter is to provide a comprehensive and insightful summary of the case and to document the process that led to the unit’s recommendation. This letter should not contain pure advocacy, but rather demonstrate a balanced summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the case for promotion as revealed and discussed in the unit’s decision making process. Be sure to discuss any negative reports or reviews included in the casebook. Explain the rationale for the decision to recommend promotion.

Additional recommendations for a quality cover letter are:

* Identify who the voting body is in your unit(s) and explain the voting method(s).
* Situate the case within the discipline and describe the deliberations that led to the ballot tally.
* Chairs/directors should get a sense from negative voters why they don’t support the case and explain that in their letter.
* Address areas of the case that need improvement. Discuss where the case is the strongest and where it is the weakest. Separate these discussions into sections identified as “Strengths” and “Weaknesses.”
* Eliminate repetition of information found elsewhere in the dossier such as the unit assessment of non-didactic teaching (when applicable) and research. Include information where the RP report might be found to be lacking sufficient information. Avoid using quotes from the outside letters.
* Include a summary of the research which is readily understandable to the interdisciplinary committees that are reviewing the case.
* Include a 2-3 sentence assessment of what impact the faculty member’s research has had either within his/her own field or more broadly. Separate this discussion into a section identified as “Statement of Impact.”
* Note if there have been any years excluded from the timing of the review for promotion but do not include any information regarding the background for the exclusion.
* For research faculty with relevant activities, please comment on his/her contributions to interdisciplinary non-didactic teaching.
* Contextualize the citation record explaining how your discipline uses it as a measure of impact. If your discipline does not use it as a measure of impact, explain that as well.
* Note if there have been any clock extensions, but do not include any information regarding the background for the promotion delay.
* Provide an explanation for circumstances such as a split vote in the unit, early promotion, promotion out of season, or other extenuating circumstances that are important to the case.
* The chair(s)/director(s) may use the cover letter to express his/her own view(s) of the case and to share feedback received from other constituencies (e.g., graduate students).
* For jointly appointed faculty the cover letter should describe the processes used in each institute, school or college to reach a promotion recommendation, as well as a description of the ways in which the two (or more) units coordinated their processes in this case.
* For jointly appointed faculty where the chairs/directors agree with the outcome, they should write one letter. If they disagree, they should write two letters. However, if there are extenuating circumstances and they want to write two letters even though they agree with the outcome, they should request an exception from the Divisional Associate Dean.
* If promotion is not being recommended, the cover letter should detail the unit’s normal procedures for evaluating candidates for promotion, any and all discrepancies between the procedures used in this case and normal procedures, and the essential reasons why the unit decided not to recommend promotion.
* If there is no substantive engagement of the negative elements, the letter will be sent back to the unit(s) for revision.

Please be aware that all recommendations from the units, negative as well as positive, will be reviewed by the Divisional Evaluation and Executive Committees, as well as by the Vice President for Research and, when appropriate, the Provost and President.

**12. REPORTING UNIT’S DECISION TO THE COLLEGE**

**AND SUBMITTING THE DOSSIER**

**Upload a .pdf of the casebook** to SharePoint for each candidate for promotion to associate research scientist or research associate professor **by noon of mid-December (for current dates see the** [**LSA Promotion Calendar**](http://lsa.umich.edu/lsa/faculty-staff/academic-affairs/policies-and-procedures/tenured-and-tenure-track-faculty/promotions.html)**).** **Upload a separate .pdf of the publication file** to SharePoint and include a copy of the CV with the publications marked. This applies to negative as well as positive recommendations. No promotion recommendation is needed for research-track promotions.

**Contents of the File**

For each candidate, compile the following information in the order noted below. (See checklist, Appdx.1)

1. Cover letter from the chair(s)/director(s) to the College Executive Committee. (See **Section 11**)
2. Curriculum vitae.
* This must be updated as of December 1st of the promotion year (see the [LSA Promotion Calendar](http://lsa.umich.edu/lsa/faculty-staff/academic-affairs/policies-and-procedures/tenured-and-tenure-track-faculty/promotions.html) for correct year) and include a revision date on page 1 of the C.V.
* Make sure the C.V is correct and up-to-date regarding the following:
1. All the candidate’s current and past appointments should be correctly stated.
2. Provide complete funding information by documenting the sources, amounts, titles, and PI structure of grant funding. List award and honors.
3. Make sure the publication status (accepted, in press, in print) of each piece of written work is up-to-date.
4. Remove any personal information, including current home address, date of birth, gender, partner status, parenthood status, names of family members, social security number, residency status, etc.
5. Place an asterisk next to each publication in the file (see item “**t**” below for details).
* When a case is being forwarded to UMOR and/or the Provost as a negative recommendation after review by the Executive Committee, we must include a C.V. that has been updated as of February 1 of the promotion year (see the [LSA Promotion Calendar](http://lsa.umich.edu/lsa/faculty-staff/academic-affairs/policies-and-procedures/tenured-and-tenure-track-faculty/promotions.html) for correct year) so that it reflects the candidate’s research productivity at the time of the Vice President for Research/Provost’s level of review. Please send the updated C.V. to Mandy Harrison (amvogel@umich.edu).

c. Unit’s assessment of candidate’s non-didactic teaching (Research professor track only – maximum of 5 pages. Do not include copies of grant applications.).

Create a separate word document that interprets teaching broadly to include activities outside the classroom, especially teaching and mentoring within the context of one or more research programs (i.e., laboratory bench science, social science, etc.) with post-doctoral fellows, junior research colleagues, or the supervision of undergraduate and graduate research projects. Include documentation of quality and quantity of teaching and mentoring activities. Comment on his/her contributions to interdisciplinary activities with regard to teaching. If this information is already provided in the RP/JRP, include a page that says “See RP/JRP Report” in the word document.

1. Candidate’s non-didactic teaching statement (Research professor track only). See **Section 4***.*
2. Unit’s assessment of candidate’s research. Create as a separate word document – maximum of 5 pages. If this information is already provided in the RP/JRP Report, do not duplicate the information here but enter “See RP/JRP Report” in this section. If it is not provided in the RP/JRP report the documentation of research must be thoughtful and thorough.
* Note that those who will read this document come from a variety of disciplines among the divisions of the College and in the University.
* Provide a brief description of the candidate’s most significant research finding. For faculty with interdisciplinary (joint) appointments, include comments on his/her contributions to interdisciplinary activities with regard to research and documentation of the candidate’s contributions to collaborative research that indicate research independence.
* Convey a sense of what those in the candidate’s specialty do and why, and then assess the place of the candidate within that specialty. Potentially relevant topics include: the convention in the candidate’s specialty for the order in which authors are listed, progress in establishing a scholarly identity distinct from that of doctoral and post-doctoral mentors, coherence and significance of the research program, breadth of mind, capacity for intellectual growth, significance of honors and recognition received, role(s) of the candidate in team research, productivity and its trajectory, the importance of external funding to success in this specialty, prospects for the future, and the candidate’s record in securing external funding to date.
* If the record is not fully specified in the C.V., provide PI and co-PI information, grant number, funding agency, title of project, duration of project, and total amount of funding for each grant.
1. Candidate’s research statement (5-page maximum - See **Section 4**).
2. Unit’s assessment of candidate’s service. Create as a separate word document – maximum of 2 pages. If this information is already provided in the RP/JRP Report, write “See RP/JRP Report” in the word document.
* Rather than reiterate items on the C.V. for the Research Professor track, try to convey the kinds of service settings in which the candidate has been and can be especially helpful.
* If the C.V. does not list service work, please provide a compilation of committee and other assignments at the unit, College, and University levels, together with the candidate’s position on the committee and the period of membership.
* While service is not required for the Research Scientist track, list any relevant service that you would like considered in the review of the case.
1. Copy of template letter(s) soliciting an external evaluation. 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 **Appdx. 2**).
2. External reviewers list (see **Sections 4 & 5**).
* 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 (see **Appdx. 5**).
* Remember that external reviewers are external to the University of Michigan. See section “o” below.
* For each reviewer indicate whether that reviewer is arm’s length or not and who chose the reviewer (candidate or unit). For research professor track cases at least **two** letters must come from reviewers chosen only by the unit.
* Provide a thorough description for each reviewer listing his/her name, title, affiliation, expertise, and professional standing, and as much detail as possible about his/her publication record and the status of his/her university within the discipline. Explain carefully the reviewer’s relationship to the candidate, if any.
* If circumstances necessitate letters from non-academics, state their expected research-track or instructional rank and provide a thorough description of the reviewer’s qualifications. The rank should be equivalent to or higher than the rank for which the candidate is being considered if the reviewer is to be counted as arm’s length.
* For each reviewer indicate whether the reviewer is at arm’s length or not, and indicate who chose the reviewer (candidate or unit or both). **At least two arm’s length letters must come from reviewers chosen only by the unit.**
* If letters are included from faculty at a lower rank, explain why. These will be counted as non-arm’s length.
* 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.
* If contacts with the reviewer were not limited to sending the letter of solicitation, describe the additional contacts. External reviewers should be contacted only by the school/college/unit. The candidate should not have any contact with external reviewers.
* Identify the reviewers by marking each letter with “A”, “B”, “C”, and so on. Throughout the file, refer to the reviewer by letter rather than by name.
1. 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 arms’ 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.
1. Copies of written responses from reviewers who declined. Please include a copy of each written response (email or letter), when available.
2. Original letters received from external reviewers.
	* Indicate “Reviewer A” at the top of the first letter, “Reviewer B” at the top of the second letter, and so on.
	* Insert a page in front of each letter with the writer’s biographical paragraph from the External Reviewer List. This is in addition to the required listing of external reviewers discussed in item j above.
	* 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. If possible this email should 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.
3. Original letters received from internal reviewers. Letters from University of Michigan faculty outside the unit are not required and should only be solicited to address particular questions (e.g., the nature of research collaboration). Specifically:
* Letters should be included from every UM program in which the candidate is appointed including dry research appointments (see **Section 7**).
* Letters from former UM faculty members are considered internal if those faculty were at Michigan during the probationary period of the candidate.
* “Unsolicited” letters are not to be included in the file. The chair/director may incorporate the feedback from those letters into his/her cover letter.

1. Preliminary Report from the RP or JRP addressed to the candidate (see **Section 8** above). This document does not make a recommendation for or against promotion.
2. Candidate’s response to the Preliminary Report (see **Section 9**).
3. Candidate’s response to new negative elements (see **Section 9**). Only applicable in negative promotion recommendations where negative elements that did not appear in the Preliminary Report emerge in the course of the discussion of the decision making body.
4. Final RP or JRP Report. Include the report that was used for the deliberation and voting by the final decision making body in the unit(s). Underline or bold all differences in the Final Report from that of the Preliminary Report. If the Final Report is identical to the Preliminary Report, then the Final Report can be a single page that says “The Final RP/JRP Report is identical to the Preliminary Report.” Include the recommendation for or against promotion as well as a list of the panel members.
5. Summary of the unit and College decision. This must be signed by the chair/director (see **Appdx 6**). Each budgeted unit involved in the promotion consideration should complete and include a separate form.
6. Copies of the candidate’s written work provided as a separate .pdf document (see last bullet).
	* It is not necessary to include every entry on the C.V. Those that are included should be in the same order as they appear on the CV.
	* Do include the candidate’s important publications and a good sampling of recent and, if appropriate, unpublished work. Please err on the inclusive side when defining “important.”
	* Do include all items that (1) were sent to external reviewers, (2) are mentioned in an external evaluation, (3) are mentioned in the candidate’s response to the Preliminary Report, and/or (4) are mentioned in one of the assessments written by a budgeted or unbudgeted unit.
	* In the case of books edited or co-edited by the candidate, include just the front matter and the portions of the book written by the candidate, plus any notes and/or references that might appear at the end of the book.
	* 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.

Many of the elements of the file are required in order to allow the Vice President for Research and the Provost when applicable to assess cases across schools and colleges and hence to maintain reasonably uniform standards for promotion throughout the University.

**13. DIVISIONAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

The Divisional Evaluation Committee (DEC) assesses the scholarly achievement and stature of every candidate for promotion of Research Faculty 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 non-didactic 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 carefully reads the cover letter from the chair(s)/director(s) to the Executive Committee. The 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 promotion case. These requests often require an almost immediate response from the unit(s). The DEC does not formally vote on the candidate’s suitability for promotion; rather, it conveys its views to the Executive Committee via members who serve on both committees.

If the unit decided not to recommend the candidate for promotion, the DEC focuses on whether or not the candidate received a procedurally correct review of his or her scholarly achievement and stature. In particular, it addresses the following questions, using the file as evidence: (1) Has the unit read the candidate’s major work critically and thoroughly? (2) Has it taken full account of the candidate’s interdisciplinary work (whether inter-unit or intra-unit in nature)? (3) Did its Review Panel include at least one person broadly conversant with the candidate’s field and/or methodology? The DEC transmits its answers to these questions to the Executive Committee.

**14. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

The Executive Committee (EC) considers the recommendation of the unit(s) and the discussion of the Divisional Evaluation Committee in light of the full record of research as well as non-didactic teaching and service, if appropriate, before it. Its discussion is informed by the report of the Divisional Evaluation Committee and by the entire promotion casebook. The Executive Committee makes a recommendation to the Vice President for Research and/or to the Provost and President (where appropriate) for or against promotion.

If the unit recommended promotion, the EC decides whether or not it too will recommend promotion. If the EC decides not to endorse the unit’s recommendation to promote, the unit(s) will be invited to meet with the EC to discuss the grounds for the EC’s decision. The appropriate Associate Dean will communicate the reasons why the EC failed to support the recommendation.

If the unit decided not to recommend promotion, the EC will review the case to ensure that it was procedurally correct.

**15. PROVOST AND Vice President for Research**

The College must submit all promotion files electronically to the Provost and UMOR no later than the due date in February (see the [LSA Promotion Calendar](http://lsa.umich.edu/lsa/faculty-staff/academic-affairs/policies-and-procedures/tenured-and-tenure-track-faculty/promotions.html) for current date). Promotion cases for research scientist track cases are decided by the Vice President for Research. The Provost and President examine research professor track files and forward positive decisions to the Regents. Neither the Vice President for Research nor the Provost automatically approves a positive recommendation from the unit and the College.

**16. BOARD OF REGENTS**

Promotion cases for research professor faculty are decided by the Board of Regents. The Regents do not review research scientist faculty promotion cases.

**17. NOTIFYING THE CANDIDATE**

Chairs/directors will receive notifications of both positive and negative decisions at the College level on the Friday before winter break. Please see **Appdx. 7** for the template letter informing the candidate of an adverse promotion recommendation.

**APPENDIX 1**

**Promotion for Research Faculty**

**CHECKLIST FOR FILE SUBMITTED TO THE COLLEGE**

**Name of Candidate:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **and Unit(s)**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(Reminder – no promotion recommendation is needed for research track promotions.)

**Upload a separate PDF of the casebook to SharePoint (do not include publications in this PDF).**

**Contents of Promotion Casebook**

**Titles in bold identify the main sections of a casebook**. Please bookmark each main section.

* **OVPR Form RS-1 Cover Page/Signature Form**
* **OVPR Form RS-2 Statement of Understanding Regarding Responsibility for Bridging Support**
* **Cover Letter to Executive Committee**
* **Candidate’s Curriculum Vitae (updated as of December 1st or for negative cases February 1st**
* **Non Didactic Teaching Documentation** (for Research Professor track only) which includes:
* Units assessment of non-didactic teaching
* Candidate’s non-didactic teaching statement
* Summary of candidate’s non-didactic teaching (see **Appdx. 4**)
* **Research Documentation**, which includes:
* Unit’s assessment of research (5 pages max.)
* Candidate’s research statement (5 pages max.)
* Details of grant activity, including PI/co-PI, granting agency, # of years, & award amount, if not listed on CV.
* Do not include copies of grant applications.
* Book contracts
* Readers reports ONLY if provided by the candidate (these may not be solicited by unit)
* Book reviews of published books
* **Services Documentation** (for Research Professor track) which includes:
* Unit’s assessment of service (2 pages max.)
* List of service assignments since appointment (if not listed on CV)
* **Solicitation Letter** (include both arm’s length & not arm’s length, if appropriate)
* **Description of External Reviewers**, which includes:
* Summary paragraph of how reviewers were selected
* Description of each external reviewer who submitted a letter
* Description of each external reviewer who declined to submit a letter
* Whether reviewers are arm’s length or not
* Whether reviewers were chosen by unit or by candidate
* Copies of written response from reviewers who declined, when available
* **External Review Letters** (each reviewer letter must be preceded by a page containing the reviewer’s biographical paragraph from the Description of External Reviewers)
* **Internal Review Letters** (if any)
* **Preliminary RP Report**
* **Candidate’s Response to Preliminary RP/JRP Report**
* **Final RP Report(s)**
* **Candidate’s Response to New Elements of RP/JRP Report** (if any)
* **Summary of Unit Decision**

**Publications**

**Upload a separate .pdf of the current CV with his/her publications to SharePoint**.

**2016 Electronic Promotion Casebooks**

**Directions for uploading electronic promotion casebooks to SharePoint - REQUIRED.**

**Dossier**

* Create one PDF document of the dossier in the order of the promotion checklist on the previous page. See directions below for assembling a PDF document.
* Name the file: lastname, firstname Research Promotion Dossier (labeled the same for all ranks).
* Go to the LSA [SharePoint site](https://sharepoint.umich.edu/lsa/ExecDropbox/Publications/Forms/AllItems.aspx) (you may need to log in with your uniquename and Kerberos password).
* Click on your department folder, click add document, and upload the file. (Note: If you’re working on a joint promotion upload to the faculty member’s administrative home folder).

**Publications**

* 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. See directions below for assembling a PDF document.
* Name the file: lastname, firstname Promotion Publications.
* Go to the LSA [SharePoint site](https://sharepoint.umich.edu/lsa/ExecDropbox/Publications/Forms/AllItems.aspx) (you may need to log in with uniquename and Kerberos password).
* Click on your department folder, click add document, and upload the file. (Note: If you’re working on a joint promotion upload to the faculty member’s administrative home folder).

For questions or SharePoint access contact Mandy Harrison, amvogel@umich.edu or 5-0659.

**Directions for inserting one PDF document into another - REQUIRED.**

1. Open the PDF that serves as the basis of the combined file.

2. Choose Tools > Pages > Insert From File.

3. Select the PDF.

4. In the Insert Pages dialog box, specify where to insert the document (before or after the first or last page, or before or after a designated page). Click OK.

5. To leave the original PDF intact as a separate file, choose Save As, and type a new name for the merged PDF.

**Directions for running text recognition on the PDF document - REQUIRED**

1. Open the PDF document

2. Choose Tools > Text Recognition > In This File.

3. In the Recognize Text box, select all pages and hit OK.

4. The tool will run through the pages of the PDF. Please note this may take several minutes.

**Directions for adding bookmarks to the PDF file - OPTIONAL**

Add bookmarks to the main sections of the promotion casebook (e.g., cover letter to EC, candidate’s CV, teaching documentation, research documentation, etc.).

Bookmark guidelines may be found [here](https://helpx.adobe.com/search.html#q=bookmarks&t=All&sort=relevancy&CommonProduct=Acrobat%20DC).

**APPENDIX 2**

**Promotion for Research Faculty**

**EXTERNAL REVIEW SOLICITATION LETTERS**

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 [**Name**] for promotion from the rank of [**insert rank**] to the rank of **[insert rank].** The research faculty track at the University of Michigan is a non-tenure track. A description of the existing position and the requirements for the requested promotion is inserted below. A table of the entire Research Faculty track established by the University of Michigan Office of Research is attached. We would very much appreciate your candid evaluation of [**her/his**]achievements as a scholar. Research Faculty at the University of Michigan are promoted on the basis of research, scholarly, and creative contributions. Recognition of the quality of **[her/his]** work by peers is a significant factor in the review process. Your scholarly and professional judgment will play an important part in our promotional evaluation of this candidate.

**[Insert appropriate section from Research Faculty Track table to show existing title and proposed title such as the example below.]**

|  |
| --- |
| **Assistant Research Scientist** |
| **Key Characteristic** | **Requirements** |
| **Scholarship** | **Potential for scholarly development, possibly as part of a larger research program.**  |
| **Record of peer-reviewed publications.**  |
| **Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.** |
| **Independence** | **Independence not required, but may be developing.** |
| **Teaching** | **No formal requirement for teaching.** |
| **Service** | **No formal requirement for institutional service.** |
| **Associate Research Scientist** |
| **Key Characteristic** | **Requirements** |
| **Scholarship** | **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.** |
| **Record of peer-reviewed publications.** |
| **Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.** |
| **Independence** | **Independence not required, but may be developing.** |
| **Teaching** | **No formal requirement for teaching.** |
| **Service** | **No formal requirement for institutional service.** |

Based on the enclosed materials and any other knowledge that you have of [**his/her**]work or professional accomplishments, we would like your candid evaluation of [**Name**]’s written and scholarly contributions in relation to others of comparable experience in this field.

[***For joint appointments, please include*, “[NAME] is engaged in research that is interdisciplinary in nature. [She/He] holds a joint appointment in the departments of [UNIT]1 and [UNIT]2. We invite your consideration of the interdisciplinary nature of [NAME]’s work in your review of her/his scholarly activity.**]

When reflecting on these criteria please provide us your evaluation of this candidate by addressing the following questions in particular:

1. Have you ever met the candidate personally? 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. How would you characterize the candidate’s field of expertise?
3. How would you gauge the candidate’s standing in relation to others who have been working in the same field?
4. If you were to compile a list of the most significant books or articles to appear recently in this field, would any of the candidate’s publications be on your list? Which ones and why?
5. Based on the UM criteria provided, do you believe that the candidate would be successful were [s**he/he**] to seek a similar position at your institution? Should [**she/he**] receive this promotion at the University of Michigan?

Your evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship – of its strengths and of its limitations – is essential to our review. We value frank judgments very highly. 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 written evaluation before [**date**]. We would also appreciate it if you would send us a brief biography or a copy of your curriculum vitae along with a brief description of your areas of expertise and current research interests.

We know that you are very busy and that we are asking you to perform a time-consuming task. You have been selected because of your expertise in this area and should you fail to respond, this will be so noted in the promotion record. We are most grateful for your willingness to help with a decision that is very important to the candidate and to the University of Michigan.

If you need further information please contact [**Name**] at 734-[**phone number**], 734-[**phone number**](fax), or [**uniqname**]@umich.edu.

Sincerely,

[**Name**] [**Name**, if joint]

[Chair/Director] [Chair/Director]

Enclosures: [**List materials provided to reviewer which should include at minimum a current CV, non-didactic teaching (if appropriate) and research statements, and selected written materials]**

**TEMPLATE LETTER TO A NON-ARM’S LENGTH REVIEWER**

Supervisor of doctoral dissertation or post-doctoral fellowship,

or important collaborator within the last ten years

 (items in bold should be modified appropriately)

[**date**]

Dear Professor[**Name**]:

The [**Unit(s)**]at the University of Michigan [**is/are**] considering [**Name**] for promotion from the rank of [**insert rank**] to the rank of **[insert rank].** The research faculty track at the University of Michigan is a non-tenure track. A description of the existing position and the requirements for the requested promotion is inserted below. A table of the entire Research Faculty track established by the University of Michigan Office of Research is attached. We would very much appreciate your candid evaluation of [**her/his**]achievements as a scholar. Research Faculty at the University of Michigan are promoted on the basis of research, scholarly, and creative contributions. Recognition of the quality of **[her/his]** work by peers is a significant factor in the review process. Your scholarly and professional judgment will play an important part in our promotional evaluation of this candidate.

**[Insert appropriate section from Research Faculty Track table to show existing title and proposed title such as the example below.]**

|  |
| --- |
| **Assistant Research Scientist** |
| **Key Characteristic** | **Requirements** |
| **Scholarship** | **Potential for scholarly development, possibly as part of a larger research program.**  |
| **Record of peer-reviewed publications.**  |
| **Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.** |
| **Independence** | **Independence not required, but may be developing.** |
| **Teaching** | **No formal requirement for teaching.** |
| **Service** | **No formal requirement for institutional service.** |
| **Associate Research Scientist** |
| **Key Characteristic** | **Requirements** |
| **Scholarship** | **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.** |
| **Record of peer-reviewed publications.** |
| **Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings.** |
| **Independence** | **Independence not required, but may be developing.** |
| **Teaching** | **No formal requirement for teaching.** |
| **Service** | **No formal requirement for institutional service.** |

Based on the enclosed materials and any other knowledge that you have of [**his/her**]work or professional accomplishments, we would like your candid evaluation of [**Name**]’s written and scholarly contributions in relation to others of comparable experience in this field.

[***For joint appointments, please include*, “[NAME] is engaged in research that is interdisciplinary in nature. [She/He] holds a joint appointment in the departments of [UNIT]1 and [UNIT]2. We invite your consideration of the interdisciplinary nature of [NAME]’s work in your review of her/his scholarly activity.**]

When reflecting on these criteria please provide us your evaluation of this candidate. Please address the following questions in particular:

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. If you supervised the candidate, how would you assess the candidate’s success at establishing and implementing [**her/his**]own program of research?
3. If you have collaborated with the candidate on scholarly work or research grants, how would you characterize the candidate’s role in your joint activities? What was the division of labor between you (and/or others) and [**her/him**] in the work that led to the publication or grant?
4. How would you gauge the candidate’s standing in relation to others who have been working in the same field?
5. Based on the UM criteria provided, do you believe that the candidate would be successful were [s**he/he**] to seek a similar promotion at your institution? Should [**she/he**] receive this promotion at the University of Michigan?

Your evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship – of its strengths and of its limitations – is essential to our review. We value frank judgments very highly. 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 written evaluation before [**date**]. We would also appreciate it if you would send us a brief biography or a copy of your curriculum vitae along with a brief description of your areas of expertise and current research interests.

We know that you are very busy and that we are asking you to perform a time-consuming task. You have been selected because of your expertise in this area and should you fail to respond, this will be so noted in the promotion record. We are most grateful for your willingness to help with a decision that is very important to the candidate and to the University of Michigan.

If you need further information please contact [**Name**] at 734-[**phone number**], 734-[**phone number**](fax), or [**uniqname**]@umich.edu.

Sincerely,

[**Name**] [**Name**, if joint]

[Chair/Director] [Chair/Director]

Enclosures: [**List materials provided to reviewer which should include at a minimum a current CV, non-didactic teaching (if appropriate) and research statements, and selected written materials**.]

**Appendix 2a.**

**Research Faculty Track Table**

|  |
| --- |
| **Assistant Research Scientist** |
| **Key Characteristic** | **Requirements** |
| Scholarship | Potential for scholarly development, possibly as part of a larger research program.  |
| Record of peer-reviewed publications.  |
| Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings. |
| Independence | Independence not required, but may be developing. |
| Teaching | No formal requirement for teaching. |
| Service | No formal requirement for institutional service. |
| **Associate Research Scientist** |
| **Key Characteristic** | **Requirements** |
| Scholarship | 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. |
| Record of peer-reviewed publications. |
| Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings. |
| Independence | Independence not required, but may be developing. |
| Teaching | No formal requirement for teaching. |
| Service | No formal requirement for institutional service. |
| **Research Scientist** |
| **Key Characteristic** | **Requirements** |
| Scholarship | Strong national and international scholarly reputation on the basis of sustained research productivity and contributions. |
| Substantial record of peer-reviewed publications. |
| Significant, sustained participation in relevant academic or professional meetings. |
| Independence | A record of independent scholarship and funding. |
| Teaching | No formal requirement for teaching. |
| Service | No formal 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 | Potential for scholarly development at a rate consistent with that of an assistant professor on the tenure track. |
| Record of peer-reviewed publications in which they are a primary author or co-author. |
| Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings. |
| Independence | Strong potential for or documented evidence of extramural funding. |
| Strong potential for development into an independent scholar. |
| 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 | Strong local and national reputation on the basis of research productivity and contributions over several years consistent with that of a tenured associate professor. |
| Substantial record of peer-reviewed publications. |
| Significant, sustained participation in relevant academic or professional meetings. |
| 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 Associate 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. |

**APPENDIX 3**

**Promotion for Research Faculty**

**TEMPLATE COVER LETTER TO**

**ACCOMPANY THE PRELIMINARY REPORT**

[**Date**]

Professor [**Name**]

[**Department/Program/Center**]

[**Office Address**]

Dear [**Name**],

Enclosed please find the preliminary report of the [**Review Panel/Joint Review Panel**] of the [**Unit**] [**and Unit, if joint**]. In line with College guidelines, we invite you to respond to this preliminary report before it is submitted to the voting body of the [**unit(s)/program(s)**] for their deliberations on making a recommendation to the College regarding your suitability for promotion. You are free to write as brief or as extensive a response to this report as you feel inclined to prepare. Please provide me with your response to this report by [**Date**], i.e., two weeks after the date of this letter at the latest. If you choose not to respond, please let me know that in writing by that date. The voting body will then be sent your response and the final version of the preliminary report from the [**Review Panel/Joint Review Panel**] that may include revisions as a result of your response.

Please feel free to talk with me at any time over the next two weeks or later about the procedures, about the report and your response.

Collegially,

[**Name**] [**Name**, if joint]

[Chair/Director] [Chair/Director]

cc: Members of [**Review Panel**]**APPENDIX 4**

**Promotion for Research Faculty**

**SUMMARY OF CANDIDATE’S Non-DIDACTIC TEACHING RECORD**

1. Doctoral Student Supervision

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Role** | **Unit** | **Status** | **Year** |
| Beth Andrews | Chair | Math | Candidate | 2006 |
| David Rock | Member | Statistics | Pre-candidate | 2009 |

1. Master’s Student Supervision

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Role** | **Unit** | **Year** |
| Mary Smith | Advisor | Math | 2004 |
| Joe Davis | Co-advisor | Math | 2005 |
| Ryan Able | Thesis committee chair | Math | 2007 |

1. Undergraduate Student Supervision

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Role** | **Unit** | **Year** |
| Mike Berg | Sr thesis supervisor | Math | 2007 |

**APPENDIX 5**

**Promotion for Research Faculty**

**Sample External Reviewers List**

**REMEMBER to insert a copy of each biographical description below in front of each external review letter in addition to providing this entire list as noted on the checklist in Appdx 1.**

**DESCRIPTION OF REVIEWER SELECTION PROCESS**

Reviewers were selected by the following process: The departmental Executive Committee named 8 reviewers. The candidate submitted a list of 9 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 department 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 11 individuals: 4 identified only by the candidate, 5 only by the department, and 2 by both. 8 letters were received (6 arms-length, 2 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. **Elsa Barkley Brown** is Associate Professor of History and Women's Studies and Affiliate in African American Studies and American Studies at the University of Maryland. Professor Brown is one of the most compelling historians exploring space, particularly in relation to African- American gender history. Among her many articles is "Mapping the terrain of Black Richmond" in the *Journal of Urban History*. **Suggested by the department (arms-length).**

E. **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 candidate (not arms-length).**

F. **Carl Marbury** is the Director of the Alabama Black History Project and Professor of the Humanities at Alabama State University. Professor Marbury is the resident historian of the Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site and was previously Distinguished University Professor at Tuskegee. As the Director of the Alabama Black History Project, he is at the helm of the most comprehensive project documenting African-American history in the state. He is a former president of Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical State University, Alabama’s black land-grant school under the Morrill Act. **Suggested by the department (arms-length).**

G. **Nan Ellin** is Associate 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).**

H. **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. Professor Michaels 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 6**

**Promotion for Research Faculty**

**SUMMARY OF THE UNIT and COLLEGE DECISION**

Candidate name:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Identify the final decision-making group in the unit and report the vote.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Group** | **# Yes** | **# No** | **# Abstain** |
|  |  |  |  |

2. Report the views of other groups within the unit.

For each of the following groups, indicate whether or not the group voted and, if it did, whether or not the outcome reflected the same view on promotion as that expressed by the final decision-making group.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Same** | **Different** | **Did Not Vote** |
| Review Panel |  |  |  |
| Executive Committee |  |  |  |
| Faculty |  |  |  |
| Other (Specify) |  |  |  |

Please indicate the size of the decision making body and explain how it is selected.

Number of members:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Method of selection:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3. The Chair/Director:

\_\_\_\_\_ Supports promotion

\_\_\_\_\_ Does not support promotion

\_\_\_\_\_ Abstains

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chair/Director signature Date

*(To be completed by Dean’s Office only)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | # Yes | # No |
| LSA Executive Committee Vote |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**APPENDIX 7**

**Promotion for Research Faculty**

**TEMPLATE LETTER INFORMING CANDIDATE OF**

**AN ADVERSE PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION**

**[date]**

Dear Dr. **[name]**:

I /We regret to inform you that the College of LSA has not recommended you for promotion to the rank of (insert rank) at the University of Michigan. This decision will be reviewed by the UM Office for Research (UMOR).

If UMOR endorses the College’s decision, your contract with the University of Michigan will expire on May 31st (see the [LSA Academic Year Calendar](http://lsa.umich.edu/lsa/faculty-staff/academic-affairs/policies-and-procedures/tenured-and-tenure-track-faculty/promotions.html) for current year). The **[Unit(s)]** however, can offer you a one-year "terminal" contract for the university year [insert next academic year]. Please let me/us know by May 1st, if you would like to exercise this option.

I/We would like to discuss your situation with you. Please come in at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

**[chair’s/director's name] chair’s/director's name, if joint]**

**[title] [title]**

cc: Divisional Associate Dean

Appendix 8

RS-1

<http://research.umich.edu/sites/default/files/resource-download/rs-1_081015.pdf>

Appendix 9

RS-2

http://research.umich.edu/sites/default/files/resource-download/rs-2\_0214.pdf

<http://research.umich.edu/content/2010/02/rs-2.pdf>