

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES FOR  
TENURE-TRACK FACULTY, 2008-2009**

The Regents shall make all promotions to tenured faculty positions on recommendation by the dean and the Executive Committee and the President. The Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) makes evaluations for promotion of faculty to higher ranks to the dean and the Executive Committee. The dean and Executive Committee consider the evaluations of the PTC and recommend candidates to the President and Board of Regents. (See School of Education Bylaws, Section 4.022 and 5.02).

**General Policies and Procedures**

Faculty members who have been in their current rank for three full years as of September 1st (of the current academic year) are eligible for consideration. In many cases, however, a longer period in rank may be advantageous to the potential candidate. Promotion and/or tenure are not automatic, nor do they depend simply on length of service. All promotions are recommended based on the candidate's performance on established criteria and priorities.

Although the faculty establishes promotion and tenure policy, policy interpretation in relation to School or other concerns and the adjudication of the promotion and tenure process are the responsibilities of the Executive Committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) is responsible for the management of the review process and the evaluation of materials submitted by candidates. The PTC is also responsible for seeking additional information relevant to each candidate when the materials available to them do not adequately address any questions that may arise.

It is the right of the eligible candidate who seeks promotion and/or tenure to receive feedback and to have access to his/her materials redacted of identifying information. The Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) submits the candidate's materials and its report and recommendation to the dean. The dean then forwards a copy of the redacted report to the candidate, who then has the opportunity to respond. The candidate sends his/her response to the dean, or indicates to the dean in writing that he/she does not choose to respond. The dean then forwards the PTC report and the candidate's materials, including any responses to the Executive Committee, for its review and action.

The Executive Committee is apprised of the PTC's procedures and internal policies each year. Changes that conflict with existing guidelines are reviewed with the Executive Committee. In reviewing the PTC's evaluations, the Executive Committee may request further review. However, they may not revise the PTC's evaluations of individual candidates.

The Executive Committee has the responsibility to review the candidate's materials before sending the recommendations to central administration. Although the Executive Committee does not repeat the deliberations of the PTC, the Executive Committee must review candidate's materials in order to identify any extenuating circumstances. Further, since the Executive Committee has the direct responsibility for the School of Education regarding personnel matters, the Executive Committee members maintain the responsibility to examine fully information regarding the candidate prior to their recommendation for promotion to the Executive Officers.

The Executive Committee, after reviewing the PTC's recommendations and the candidate's portfolio, and considering various School-wide concerns, will or will not recommend the candidate for promotion. The Dean then notifies candidates of the actions of the Executive Committee and submits the recommendation of the school regarding promotion and/or tenure to the Provost's office. Should the dean disagree with the decision of the Executive Committee on a candidate, the dean will submit a separate file on that candidate to the Provost.

### **Role of the Candidate**

It is the responsibility of the candidate to adhere to the established schedule put forward each year in the *Promotion and Tenure Timeline for Tenure-track Faculty*. This schedule indicates the dates by which the candidate must 1) notify the Deans' office that he or she intends to submit his or her application for promotion and/or tenure, 2) meet with the program chair to discuss mentors and identify potential external reviewers, 3) submit materials for external review to the Deans' office, 4) submit a complete set of materials to the PTC for its review, and 5) submit a response to the redacted report of the PTC forwarded by the Deans' office.

Candidates should work with their mentors (if they so choose) to determine how best to document their contributions and provide evidence of excellence in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. It is the candidate's responsibility to correct any School records that are inaccurate, (course load, advisee load, etc). The candidate is also responsible for presenting his or her portfolio in an organized manner that is at once complete and concise, and easily accessed by those needing to review the materials.

Candidates must also decide if they will provide a written response to the redacted report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee after the dean has forwarded it to them. Candidates who choose to respond are invited to comment on the report in terms of clarification, neglected or additional information that came in after the review began, and/or any extenuating circumstances that may warrant further consideration before a decision will be rendered. The candidate may elect not to respond to the report without penalty by notifying the dean in writing.

### **Role of the Program Chair**

The program chair is responsible for assisting both the candidate and the PTC in the promotion and/or tenure review process as follows.

1. Shortly after the candidate has indicated that he or she intends to apply for promotion and/or tenure, the program chair meets with him or her to discuss mentors and to develop a list of twelve (12) potential external reviewers for submission to the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC). Suggested external reviewers should be chosen on the basis of their perceived capacities to evaluate a candidate's record in a balanced, thoughtful, and careful manner. Reviewers will be asked to comment on the standing of the candidate's research relative to that of leading scholars in their field. Please note that the PTC may choose reviewers not recommended by the candidate or the chair, and that candidates should NOT contact anyone regarding possible service as an external reviewer. (See also Identifying External Reviewers)
2. Subsequent to the meeting with the candidate, the program chair attends an organizational meeting with the PTC and the dean to discuss procedures and select external reviewers.
3. Shortly after the candidate submits his or her full set of materials, the program chair, in cooperation with the Dean's Office and the Office of Student Services, furnishes the PTC with a cover sheet that includes the following information about each candidate:
  - a. type of review: assistant to associate; associate to full; tenure eligibility
  - b. candidate's year of initial appointment to School of Education
  - c. candidate's year of promotion to present rank (if applicable)
  - d. list of courses taught by candidate, including student enrollments and indications of releases from teaching
  - e. list of independent studies and other credit-generating arrangements
  - f. list of dissertation committees the candidate has been on or chaired, including those outside the School of Education
4. In addition to the information required in #3, the program chair also submits a written **evaluation** of each candidate to the PTC. This evaluation should include:
  - a. a summary of the candidate's past, present, and future role in the program
  - b. a summary of a survey of the candidate's former and current students
  - c. a careful synopsis of prior reviews of the candidate's progress and results of annual evaluations
  - d. the candidate's fourth year review report, including the PTC's recommendation regarding contract renewal, along with a copy of any response the candidate may have sent to this report

- e. an evaluation of the candidate's contribution to the program in terms of teaching, scholarly activity, and service including a clear and unambiguous recommendation regarding the disposition of the candidate's case

### **Identifying External Reviewers**

After notifying the program chair and dean of the intention to apply for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate is expected to consult with his or her program chair to name twelve (12) potential external reviewers. The Promotions and Tenure Committee, in consultation with the program chair and the dean, will select and contact reviewers regarding their willingness to serve in this capacity. Please note that the PTC may choose reviewers not recommended by the candidate or the chair.

Suggested external reviewers should be chosen on the basis of their perceived capacities to evaluate a candidate's record in a balanced, thoughtful, and careful manner. Reviewers will be asked to comment on the standing of the candidate's research relative to that of leading scholars in their field. When listing potential reviewers, promotion and/or tenure candidates are asked to consider the status of the reviewers in the field, and to adhere to the following guidelines:

1. For each reviewer named, the candidate should submit the reviewer's
  - a. complete address
  - b. telephone number
  - c. email address
  - d. a brief summary of their credentials
  - e. a brief statement identifying the reviewer's area of expertise, national standing, and why this potential reviewer is being suggested as an appropriate reviewer for the candidate.
2. **Candidates should NOT contact these individuals regarding their possible service as external reviewers.**
3. Ten of the twelve reviewers should not include former students, candidate's dissertation committee members, or people with whom the candidate has collaborated on publications. At the discretion of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC), one or two reviewers can include former collaborators or co-authors.
4. External reviewers should complement each other and should, as a group, be able to provide a comprehensive review (methodology, content, etc.) of the candidate's body of work.
5. Candidates and potential reviewers are strongly discouraged from discussing the candidate's evaluation with one another.

### **Areas of Evaluation**

In making recommendations for promotion and/or tenure, the whole record of each candidate will be reviewed. To warrant a recommendation for promotion and/or tenure, a candidate must show a substantial contribution in scholarship and teaching. Service activities are considered complementary to scholarship and teaching. The categories to be considered in determining promotion and/or tenure are scholarly activity, teaching, service, and general considerations.

**Scholarly Activity** - Four types of scholarly activity are identified for evaluation and demonstration of significant performance. Although each type of activity may not be emphasized, there should be no doubt about the scholarly contribution of the candidate.

1. Critical contribution to the historical and continuing development of the candidate's field of scholarly activity including significant ideas, models and theories being advanced. Demonstration of success is identified by major publication in the candidate's field and in the larger domain of educational scholarship.

2. Systematic collection of materials from significant investigations; critical appraisal of experimental work; publication of summaries and critiques; synthesizing of new developments and organizing them for the benefit of scholars in a particular field; evidence of work with students through joint publications and conference presentations; evidence of high quality doctoral dissertations; preparation of texts and/or other instructional materials.
3. Direct participation in original investigation at the theoretical stage, the operational stage, or both; preparation and publications of reports of such investigation in scholarly publications.
4. Direct participation in the development of instructional materials for use in schools and/or in higher education when this work contributes to new knowledge as evidenced by publication.

**Teaching** - In this area candidates will be evaluated on the impact of their teaching and how they are engaged in the process of improving their practice in response to self-evaluation and the feedback of others. Evaluations will be made in four areas of involvement in teaching as described below. Although each area may not be emphasized, there should be no doubt that the candidate has made a substantial contribution to teaching. :

1. **Course Development.** Course development includes information about the types of courses that serve a program or contribute to a larger university community, (e.g. cross-listed, interdisciplinary courses); reflections on course design and course goals; and contributions to program development. The enrollments of new and regularly offered courses should also be summarized here along with information about the types of students that typically take these courses (e.g. advanced doctoral students, masters students, undergraduates).
2. **Enactment of Teaching Activity.** Faculty should provide examples of course activities; teaching activities or innovative techniques that engage students in learning, and strategies to improve one's teaching over time.
3. **Impact of Teaching.** Faculty should demonstrate the impact of their teaching through several means, which must include student evaluations, but could also include materials presenting evidence of student learning. Other forms of evidence could include: peer evaluations of teaching, external review of teaching materials, and awards/recognition for teaching.
4. **Mentoring.** Faculty should document advising of undergraduate and graduate students; chairing of dissertations and service on dissertation committees (in both the school and university); the training of graduate student research assistants and graduate instructors; and any long-term outcomes for students (in terms of careers) for whom they have played a significant role in mentoring.

**Service** – In the area of service, faculty need to demonstrate effective performance at local, state/regional, national, and/or international levels, as well as at program, school, and/or university levels as follows.

1. To the profession, generally speaking; e.g., membership in and the holding of office in professional and scholarly organizations.
2. To local communities and the state through consultation, service on committees, professional development, and other similar activities related to the general field of education.
3. To the School of Education and the university through activities such as program development and/or membership on committees and other internal governing and administrative bodies.

**General Considerations** - The following general considerations serve as a backdrop to the evaluation of scholarship, teaching, and service.

1. Assumption of one's fair share of responsibility for the work of the School in terms of the priorities established by the faculty and administration

2. Active and constructive participation in the affairs of one's instructional program
3. Adherence to commonly accepted standards of professional ethics in relations with colleagues and students
4. Those who carry substantial formal administrative duties will generally not be able to spend as much time on scholarly work. Administrative effort will be explicitly considered in assessment for promotion. Productivity in scholarship and teaching may decrease in proportion to the time necessary for administrative tasks. However, while the scholarly contributions of an administrative candidate might be fewer than others, they should be of equally high quality, and should leave no questions about the candidate's capacity to perform as a full-time scholar should he/she leave administration.

### **Preparing Materials for Review**

**\*Materials should also be submitted electronically (in Microsoft Word format) to the Dean's office.**

Candidates must first submit materials for external reviewers to the Deans' Office during the summer following notification of intent to go up for promotion and/or tenure (see *Timeline for Promotion and Tenure for Tenure-track Faculty* for exact date). Ten (10) sets of materials should be submitted that include at least five (5) but no more than six (6) publications, a curriculum vita\*, and a personal statement\* that provides the context for the submitted publications.

Candidates must also submit one hardcopy of a full set of materials to the Promotion and Tenure Committee on the Friday before Labor Day of the year of their review (see *Timeline for Promotion and Tenure for Tenure-track Faculty* for exact date). These materials should include the following sections: Introduction, Scholarly Activity and Research, Teaching, Service, Curriculum Vitae, and Faculty Annual Reports (FARs).

The **Introduction** should be a brief statement that provides a rationale for the candidate's case for promotion and/or tenure.

The section on **Scholarly Activity and Research** should include both an overview\* and supporting documentation. The overview should be a description of the candidate's scholarly contributions that includes summaries of information where appropriate, and references to the supporting documentation (**not to exceed 10-15 double-spaced pages**). This overview is likely to be similar to the statement submitted previously for external reviewers. The supporting documentation should include books (published or under contract, including author, editor, contributor), journal articles (published or in press, including citation), conference papers (only if accepted for further publication), final and/or interim reports from sponsored research projects. For all co-authored publications that have been sent to reviewers, candidates should provide a statement indicating their role in the work leading to the publication along with the contact information for at least one of the co-authors.

The **Teaching** section should also include both an overview\* and supporting documentation. The overview should be a statement of teaching and mentoring activities, including **summaries\*** of student and course evaluations and comments if available (**not to exceed 10-15 double-spaced pages**). The supporting documentation should include course syllabi\* and handouts (only those pertinent to most recent course offerings), and student and course evaluations.

Similarly, the section of **Service** should include both an overview\* and supporting documentation. The overview should be a statement of service activities at the local, regional/state, national/international, and program/school/university levels (**not to exceed 5-8 double-spaced pages**). The supporting documentation would include items such as workshop/seminar materials (of a service nature), evidence of service to professional organizations, and/or evidence of service to Program, School, University.

Candidates should use the Promotion and/or Tenure Portfolio Checklist to make certain that their materials are complete. This checklist should be signed and included with the full set of candidate materials. **Candidates are reminded that the total number of overview pages should not exceed 30 double spaced pages, and that summaries\* and charts\* should be used whenever possible.**