

APPROVED October 27, 1993

**CASL GUIDELINES FOR TENURE-TRACK
FACULTY APPOINTMENTS, AWARDING OF TENURE,
AND PROMOTION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES**

I. Authority. The statements by the Regents of the University of Michigan in the document entitled Qualifications for Appointment and Promotion in the Several Faculties of The University of Michigan and elsewhere in the Regents' Bylaws are the bases of the following Guidelines for the College of Arts, Sciences, and Letters (CASL) of the University of Michigan-Dearborn (UM-D). Other sources have also been used, for example, statements from the UM-D Academic Affairs Advisory Council, the UM-D Campus Bylaws, the CASL Bylaws, and the bylaws of the individual Departments. Nothing in the Guidelines should be construed to be contradictory to or to supersede other statements which have higher authority. The Guidelines were approved in the present form by the CASL Governing Faculty on October 27, 1993.

II. Scope. The Guidelines have been developed to inform and guide the faculty, their elected or appointed faculty representatives, and CASL administrators in their interpretation and implementation of standards and procedures relating to tenure-track faculty appointments, promotions, and the awarding of tenure.

III. Categories of Appointments and Status. Faculty appointments at UM-D fall into several categories: tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure track. Before a tenured member of the UM-D teaching staff can be dismissed or demoted for cause, the procedures prescribed in Regents' Bylaw Section 5.09 must be followed.

Although new appointments may be made without immediate tenure at even the higher professorial levels, the ranks of (Full) Professor and of Associate Professor are normally tenured appointments. (New appointments at these levels with immediate tenure are also subject to approval by the Regents, as are awards of tenure to faculty after probationary periods at UM-D). The ranks of Assistant Professor and of Instructor are tenure-track appointments which are considered probationary. Appointments as Instructor, however, are not normally made in CASL. Candidates for a tenure-track appointment who are close to but have not yet completed all of the requirements for their terminal degree are given a maximum of two one-year appointments at the level of Full-time Lecturer which do not count as part of the probationary period. Appointments at the level of Lecturer--Full--or Part-time, Regular or Supplementary--are non-tenure track. Service as a Lecturer does not normally count as a part of the probationary period. (There are other kinds of appointments, such as Adjunct and Visiting, but they are outside the purview of the Guidelines. For more information regarding such appointments, one may consult The Standard Practice Guide of the University of Michigan.)

IV. Appointments: Policies and Procedures. When a new faculty or a replacement position is authorized, the Department Chair initiates steps to fill it. The UM-D is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer, and although no quotas are ever mandated, bona fide efforts, properly documented, must be made to satisfy the University's objectives in this area. In attempting to fill tenure-track positions, the College must conduct a documentable national search, with appropriate notice in relevant publications and/or to relevant organizations.

Individual Departments have the authority to develop their own search, screening, interviewing, and selection processes, so long as they do not violate the University's policies on equal opportunity, faculty participation, openness, and objectivity. When the appropriate Departmental body, consisting of members of the CASL Governing Faculty, decides to recommend a candidate for an appointment to a tenure-track position, the Department Chair is responsible for forwarding the candidate's curriculum vitae and supporting documents, including the Appointment Activity Records, to the Dean, for action by the CASL Executive Committee. (Departments may choose at the same time to recommend acceptable alternative candidates). Without approval by the Executive Committee, no tenure-track appointment can be made. Favorable actions by the Executive Committee on appointments of Assistant Professors are subject to approval by the UM-D Chancellor and the President of the University. Appointments at the levels of Associate Professor or Professor are, in addition, subject to approval by the Board of Regents.

Normally, initial appointments are made without immediate tenure, and the terms of the probationary period are specified in the letter of appointment, which is prepared and sent by the Dean, after consultation with the Department Chair. As noted above, in those rare cases of appointments with immediate tenure, approval of the Regents must be obtained before the offer of appointment may be finalized.

Decisions related to credit for previous post-doctoral college-level teaching experience are made by the Dean, in the light of negotiations between the appointee and the Department Chair, and between the Chair and the Dean. A maximum of three years of such service may be credited toward the UM-D probationary period of appointees at the level of Assistant Professor.

Decisions on tenure for appointees previously holding tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor are usually made not earlier than the second nor later than the third year at UM-D.

V. Annual Faculty Reports and Reviews. Once appointed, every full-time CASL faculty member is required annually to prepare a written report on his/her recent professional activities--teaching, research and/or creative activities, and service. Faculty in the probationary status must be reviewed annually by their appropriate tenured Department colleagues. (Only Professors may review and evaluate tenured Associate Professors; tenured Associate Professors shall participate in the evaluation of non-tenured Associate Professors; only Professors may review probationary Professors). The annual reviews of probationary faculty must specifically evaluate their performance in all relevant areas, indicate whether they are making progress toward promotion and/or tenure, and specify the deadline for a decision on tenure or terminal appointment. The reviews of tenured Associate Professors may be at less frequent intervals, in accordance with departmental bylaws. When effected, they should evaluate performance in all areas and should indicate whether progress toward promotion to Professor is being made. The purpose of regular evaluations of faculty, however, is not only to document qualifications for promotion and tenure, but also to aid individual faculty members in assessing their strengths and weaknesses and to encourage them to realize their full potential.

Limited reviews of Professors are made annually by the Department Chair in connection with his/her recommendations affecting salary increments. Full-scale reviews of Professors are made at longer intervals (four to six years) by an Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation of Full Professors chosen and chaired by the Dean (See Appendix I, "Evaluation of Full Professors").

VI. Areas of Evaluation. In all required faculty reviews (annual and other) and in all recommendations related to promotion, tenure, and/or termination, faculty must be evaluated in three areas, which are defined in accordance with Regents' documents. The three areas are (1) teaching, (2) research and/or

creative activity, and (3) service. The complementary relationship between teaching and research should be emphasized, even though some separate evaluation of the two areas will be required. In official documents recommending promotion or tenure, the terms to be used in characterizing levels of performance are as follows: (1) excellent, (2) significantly capable, and (3) competent. The criteria and methods of evaluation are clarified in the following.

A. Teaching. An essential qualification for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure in CASL is the ability to teach, chiefly at the undergraduate but, when required, also at the graduate level. Some of the elements to be evaluated are knowledge of subject matter, skill in presentation, experience, interest in students, creativity, ability to stimulate thinking, enthusiastic devotion to teaching, integrity, versatility, and capacity for cooperation with colleagues and administration in the achievement of Discipline, Department, and College instructional goals.

Acceptable kinds of evidence for evaluating teaching performance shall include student evaluations, peer judgment, and the faculty member's class materials, such as statements and objectives and methodologies, course syllabi, assignments, and examinations.

1. Student Evaluations:

a. Evaluations Normally Written in Class on Departmental Forms.

It should be realized that the primary rationale for and importance of student evaluations is their potential contribution to improved teaching, and the forms, always subject to Departmental approval, should be designed with this goal clearly in mind. Such evaluations may also constitute useful evidence in considerations of salary increments, reappointments, promotions, and tenure.

The responsibility for the development of one or more appropriate student evaluation forms and for their distribution, interpretation, and filing rests with the Departments. Student evaluation forms should include substantial opportunities for essay-type responses. They should be administered toward the end of the term in which they are used. Full-time faculty should be evaluated by their respective students in at least one regular term every academic year. Except in the cases of new faculty, the evidence constituted by student evaluations should cover a period of at least two years. Completed forms should be filed in Department offices for a minimum of five years, at the end of which they should be given to the faculty, to be disposed of as they see fit. All faculty should be made fully aware of the basis for analysis of each evaluation form used.

Department Chairs should review the student evaluations with the respective faculty members, as well as all other evidence gathered in regard to his/her performance, before such evidence is presented to administrators and faculty committees above the Department level. In no case will student evaluations be allowed to constitute the only basis for determining a faculty member's teaching ability.

b. Optional Supplements to Student Evaluations Written in Class.

If a Department wishes to, it may solicit written evaluations from graduates of UM-D who have in the past taken a course or courses from faculty members being reviewed.

2. Class Materials and Statements of Objectives.

Faculty members should be encouraged to present to their Department Chairs any materials used in their courses which can provide evidence of their teaching practices and proficiency. They may also submit as evidence a statement of their objectives in various courses and an explanation of their teaching methods. Printed copies of statements distributed to students would be ideal. All such materials should be incorporated into a permanent dossier of the individual faculty member.

3. Peer Judgment.

Although in the normal process of considering promotions and/or awarding tenure, only superiors in rank are permitted to participate in discussion and vote on recommendations, it is appropriate for the opinions of faculty in any rank to be considered if they have been in a position to observe a colleague's teaching performance. Such opinions should be written, and copies should be forwarded with the faculty member's dossier to extra-departmental committees when promotion and/or tenure recommendations are being considered.

Evaluative classroom visitation by colleagues should be considered one of several methods for determining the quality of teaching for individual faculty members of all ranks. However, the separate departments in the College have the responsibility for determining mechanisms for carrying out classroom visitations, except that any formal assessment of teaching through classroom visitation must be based on a sufficient number of visits (more than one) to establish a pattern. Classroom visitations by colleagues should be carried out for the improvement of faculty teaching and ordinarily with the consent of the faculty member being visited. If a faculty member feels this method of evaluation is being used unfairly or in an intimidating manner, he or she may ask that the Dean of the College investigate the matter with the Department Chair and, if there is no resolution at the department level, to submit it to the CASL Executive Committee for a decision.

As another alternative, a faculty member may cite public lectures, presentations at faculty seminars, team-teaching courses, or offering guest lectures in another teacher's class as evidence of his/her teaching ability. Peer judgments of teaching ability may, of course, be formed by associations between colleagues entirely outside the classroom.

Peer judgments based on evidence other than student evaluations must constitute a part of the evaluation of teaching ability in every recommendation affecting promotion and/or tenure.

B. Research and Creative Activity. It is expected that an effective teacher will be continually engaged in study and research and that some of these activities will result in written conclusions of artifacts which are open to evaluation by the faculty member's peers, both within the UM-D and outside of it. It is Campus policy that the published research of faculty being considered for promotion and/or tenure be evaluated by relevant outside scholars. For details, please see Appendix II.

Although publication of scholarly work is normally regarded as testimony of its worth to the scholarly world, a faculty member's publications must not be evaluated merely by their number or volume. When publication occurs in refereed journals, the caliber of such work is automatically attested to; but in cases of publication for which there is no evidence of extensive critical review

prior to publication, the discipline of the faculty member concerned will have a clear responsibility for an especially careful review. The emphasis in evaluating a faculty member's performance in research should be on determining whether it shows evidence of truly original, scholarly activity.

The receipt of a grant for the support of scholarly research may be taken as corroborative evidence of one's recognition as a scholar.

The public oral presentation of papers or the existence of papers completed but not yet published may be taken as evidence of scholarly activity, but such evidence should be considered only as supplemental to works actually published. Again, it is essential when this type of activity is being considered in connection with promotion and/or tenure recommendations that it be evaluated by outside reviewers. If works have been accepted for publication but are not yet in print, conclusive documentation must be required to support commitments for publication.

Participation in professional organizations of a scholarly nature and editorial duties for scholarly journals, including service as a referee, should be attested to by copies of relevant correspondence, statements in the journal (e.g., in the masthead), or programs indicating the nature of one's participation in conferences, etc.

Writings outside of one's professional scholarly field should be evaluated on the basis of their impact on the general intellectual community and on the basis of evidence they give of the author's intellectual vitality and knowledge.

"Professional research," for the purpose of the Guidelines, includes both writing within a particular discipline and writing of a multi- or interdisciplinary nature. It should be recognized that the professional interests and expertise of many faculty members may not be limited to the area of their official academic appointments, and that original research may often challenge what are presently accepted as "the boundaries of a discipline." There are other types of writing which, although on the periphery of a faculty member's professional interests, may nevertheless be of scholarly value. Such writings should be evaluated on their own merit by the members of the discipline and should be credited to the extent that they demonstrate sustained intellectual effort. (It is possible that although a particular piece of writing might not count in this category, it might very well prove to be an important service contribution and be credited in that category).

Review articles of other works should be considered indicative of research only if they demonstrate the breadth of the reviewer's knowledge and make a contribution to scholarship in the area. A simple summary would not satisfy these criteria. For example, writing textbooks or original reports (such as encyclopedia articles) or computer software may in some fields and in some instances be regarded as scholarly activity, especially if one is asked to perform such work because of his/her reputation as a scholar.

In certain academic areas in CASL a faculty member's activities in the field of creative arts may also count toward promotion and/or tenure. Every effort will be made to evaluate creative activities rigorously. The quality of musical performances, for example, may be established by published reviews in the local press or other forms of outside evaluation. A painter or sculptor may be evaluated in the light of the types of exhibitions (e.g., juried, nationwide, one-person, sponsored) in which the works appear and, again, through critical reviews of such exhibitions. Local performances or exhibitions may be judged by colleagues in the same or related disciplines. A campus play production, for example, should be considered serious evidence of a faculty member's

artistic and creative abilities, and the written judgments of colleagues should be given weight. Literary pieces--short stories, poems, novels, etc.--can of course be judged in ways which are comparable to those which are applied to published research.

Although faculty members may well be judged in the category of research and creative activity primarily on the basis of creative activity, ordinarily every faculty member will be expected to demonstrate the ability to produce written results of scholarly research. If the faculty member is given released time for assigned creative activities, such as for the production of a play or conducting a musical group, his/her performance in this area should be evaluated according to whether it goes beyond the minimal assigned duties for which the released time is granted.

C. Service. The scope of the University's purposes and activities is such as to make it appropriate for members of the various faculties to engage in many activities outside the specific fields of teaching and research-and-creative pursuits. These are grouped under the heading of "service," and each faculty member is to be evaluated on his/her performance in this area, too. These may include active participation in committee work at the Department, College, Campus, and University levels; service on task forces for the development and/or evaluation of programs and facilities related to the reshaping or expansion of the Campus or University; performing semi- or full-scaled administrative duties; advising students; initiating constructive additions to curricula; and promoting scholarly, creative, or social activities. In an institution in which faculty governance is basic, faculty members should display a willingness and the ability to perform a variety of Departmental, College, Campus, and University services.

The weight given to committee and task-force service should vary according to the degree of an individual's participation in them. A chairperson of a committee should of course receive more credit for his/her work than a general member, and a member who writes a committee or task force report ought to receive special recognition. In all cases, the degree of participation and/or responsibility should be cited in the individual's academic dossier. A report from the committee chair or from the individual to whom the committee reports may be requested.

The matter of released time and/or an administrative differential may also enter into the evaluation of one's participation in committee and/or administrative work. The fact that a faculty member has been given an assignment which calls for released time and/or an administrative differential is of course an indication that he/she possesses at least above average skills, but the precise level of achievement will have to be determined in each instance.

Since the University as a whole has an obligation to serve the various communities in which it is situated, certain kinds of extra-mural professional contributions to society may also be taken into consideration in evaluating a faculty member's performance.

Evidence of University-related service may consist of (1) reports from the committees on which the faculty member has served; (2) judgments by the member's peers on the extent and quality of his/her impact on procedures and policies in the Department, College, Campus, and University; and (3) the faculty member's own description of his/her activities, possibly coupled with relevant correspondence, news reports, etc. As a matter of policy, committee reports should always acknowledge those who wrote or drafted them, and copies of relevant ones should be filed with the dossiers of each committee member.

VII. Mid-Term Review of Untenured Assistant Professors.

Purpose:

1. The mid-term review is an opportunity to evaluate more fully the performance of untenured assistant professors, usually during the sixth semester of service (or as early as the fourth semester, when the junior faculty member, with the permission of the Dean and Executive Committee, is counting teaching experience at another institution). The mid-term review may also serve as a basis for counseling and advice, and this review also serves as an opportunity for junior faculty members to begin gathering materials for their teaching and research portfolios.
2. The mid-term review is not a tenure review and no firm commitment to recommend tenure can or will be made during or as a result of this review, although Department Chairs should feel free to discuss with candidates whether their performance is developing properly toward that end.

Documentation:

1. Self-Evaluation

- a. The self-evaluation should contain a record of courses taught, syllabi of those courses, the candidate's estimate of his/her effectiveness in teaching, citation of concerns expressed by the students in their evaluations and any action undertaken to correct problems or difficulties, as well as a description, including numbers, of advising duties.

The candidate may also wish to prepare a portfolio of other evidence relating to the teaching record, including such evidence as sample tests, writing assignments, sample student responses, patterns of enrollment, evaluations and responses resulting from classroom visitation, and the like.

- b. The self-evaluation should then address the question of scholarly development since appointment to the College, his/her current scholarly agenda, and plans for the immediate future. In addition to chronicling the results of scholarly activities, the candidate should speak to his/her concerns about the work, indicating to what extent his/her own expectations of performance have been met. The candidate should offer an analysis of scholarly development, citing progression from the dissertation topic and approach.

- c. The section on service in the self-evaluation should consider committee participation as well as other on-campus contributions. In those instances in which the individual professional expertise has been shared with the community outside the College, note should be made. No supporting documentation is necessary for the community service portion of the self-evaluation.

2. Student evaluations.
3. Evidence of scholarly activity and accomplishment, such as reprints and copies.

Since the evaluation is an internal one involving the candidate and the tenured members of the department, outside evaluations of scholarly work are inappropriate for the mid-term review.

Process:

1. All items listed under Documentation are made available to the Department Chair and tenured members of the department. All are expected to read the documentation carefully.
2. The Department Chair will call a meeting of all tenured members of the department to discuss the candidate's suitability for meeting the identified long-term needs of the department and the candidate's progress toward meeting the CASL criteria for tenure and promotion.
3. Following this discussion, the Department Chair prepares a letter summarizing the position or positions of the tenured members of the department. The Department Chair may wish to share the responsibility for the preparation of this document with some or all tenured members of the department. The Department Chair may also offer an individual evaluation.
4. The completed summary is sent to the candidate, the Dean, and tenured department members. The candidate may respond if he/she wishes.
5. The Department Chair's individual evaluation, should one be offered, is also made available to the candidate, who may respond if he/she wishes.
6. The extent to which the Department Chair or other tenured members of the staff may wish to follow this exercise with counseling is a matter particular to each departmental situation. However, the College Executive Committee suggests that written memoranda of any such counseling be kept by the individuals acting as counselors. Whether copies of these need to be sent to the candidate and Dean is not a matter for direction; however, should such items be sent to the Dean for inclusion in the candidate's file or kept in a departmental personnel file, copies must be provided to the untenured Faculty member.
7. All evaluation letters and the candidate's responses are received by the Dean, and are maintained for future reference. The Executive Committee has no role in the evaluation itself, and does not recommend personnel actions based on the mid-term evaluation. However, the Executive Committee has general responsibility for oversight of the review process, and the Dean may present evaluations to them, as information, when required for policy formation or revision or for the clarification of questions that may arise in the course of a particular evaluation.

VIII. Combined Qualifications Necessary for Promotion and/or Tenure.

The three areas of a faculty member's activity just discussed must be central to any evaluations--annual, periodic, or in connection with recommendations affecting promotion and/or tenure. Evaluations of probationary faculty which are unsatisfactory should lead to non-renewal of appointments. When reappointments or recommendations for promotion and/or tenure are considered, the levels of performance have to be positive in all areas.

Three terms of evaluation are considered standard and are to be used in official documents recommending promotion and/or tenure: (1) excellent, (2) significantly capable, and (3) competent.

Promotions in CASL require certain levels of performance in the various categories, as follows: The minimum requirements are that the faculty member (1) must be considered excellent in at least one category; (2) must give evidence of at least significant capability both in teaching and in research and/or creative activity; and (3) must be judged at least competent in service. Positive evidence must be provided in every category; in the absence of evidence, not even competence may be merely assumed.

Promotions from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor normally include tenure, and they must therefore be regarded as critical for both the institution and the individual. Although recommendations for such promotions must be based on demonstrated and appropriate levels of performance, they should be granted only to those who in addition show great promise of eventually being qualified for promotion to the rank of Professor. Promotion to the rank of Professor should be made on the basis of demonstrated development since promotion to Associate Professor, on the basis of a reputation outside of the University, as well as on evidence of a capacity and willingness for continued growth.

No promotion is automatic, nor does it depend simply on length of service, in general or in the various ranks. All promotion recommendations are subject to approval by the Regents.

A. To Associate Professor. The maximum period of probation in full-time service before a decision is made on the promotion of an Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (with tenure) is normally six years. This period may be somewhat shorter for those with previous full-time service at other institutions (see p. 3), or for those whose performance is exceptional. In all cases this decision must be made before the beginning of the eighth year of service. If the promotion to Associate Professor and tenure are awarded, they will be effective at the beginning of the academic year after the decision is approved by the Regents. If promotion and tenure are denied, the faculty member will be awarded a terminal one-year appointment. Notice of non-reappointment must be given no later than the fifteenth day of the first month of the terminal academic year. (Standard Practice Guide 201.88).

B. To Professor. Since the rank of Professor is a mark of the highest academic distinction, the length of time required for promotion to Professor cannot be pinpointed; historically, however, promotions to Professor after five to ten years in rank as Associate Professor have been considered in the normal range. There is no time period after which promotion to Professor would be automatic if the appropriate criteria listed above are not met.

IX. Procedures Within CASL for the Consideration of Promotion and Tenure.

Promotion and tenure recommendations are expected to originate in the several Departments of the College. Early in each fall term the Dean reminds the Chairs of their responsibilities in this area and establishes some relevant deadlines. All faculty members in each category are to be considered for promotion and/or tenure and specific decisions made as to whether an individual case should be pursued and given complete reviews, after which decisions on whether to forward individual cases to the College will be made.

If any faculty member believes that he/she has been denied due process for promotion and/or tenure by the Chair and/or the Department committee, that person may appeal directly to the Dean for an informal review, and the latter may direct the Department to conduct the usual, formal review.

At all levels, only tenured members of the respective Governing Faculties may participate in discussions and decisions affecting promotions and awards of tenure. Furthermore, only Associate Professors and Professors may be involved in actions affecting Assistant Professors, and only Professors may be involved in actions affecting tenured Associate Professors and probationary Professors. Both tenured Professors and tenured Associate Professors are to be involved in evaluating non-tenured Associate Professors.

Normally, faculty appointments, promotions, and tenure decisions involve only one Department; however, when a person has been actively involved in academic instruction and research in disciplines in more than one Department, he/she may ask the Dean, in consultation with the Chairs of the relevant Departments, to appoint a special review committee to evaluate the faculty member's performance and, if appropriate, to make promotion and/or tenure recommendations to the College. Because of the serious implications of tenure, the Chairs of the Departments concerned shall be voting members of such a special committee. If a faculty member has official appointments in two or more Departments, the procedures just outlined shall also apply.

If there is no one of the appropriate rank in a Department who is qualified by professional training to evaluate the research performance of a faculty member in that Department, outside evaluations of the scholarship may, from time to time, be provided even when a promotion and/or tenure decision is not immediately being considered.

In cases where the Department Chair or the Dean is an Associate Professor and considerations of promotion to Professor are involved, the Chair or Dean shall not serve on the committee during the discussion of any cases affecting promotions to Professor or awarding tenure to probationary Professors. A chairperson, with vote, shall be chosen from among the other members by these members, and this ad hoc chairperson shall perform all of the duties of the Chair or Dean whom he/she replaces. Under no circumstances may one be present when his/her promotion and/or tenure is being considered by an evaluation committee. However, because of higher administrative responsibilities, an administrator replaced in the above circumstances (Chair or Dean) shall have the privilege of meeting with the evaluation committee to hear their rationale(s) for their decisions (both affirmative and negative). He/she shall be required to forward to the next level any cases acted on favorably, but he/she may accompany them, as usual, with personal evaluations (positive or negative).

No evaluation committee, at whatever level, shall consist of fewer than three members. If in a given term a Department should have fewer than three people of the rank(s) required to constitute a legal committee, the Chair shall inform the Dean of the problem and the Dean, in consultation with the Chairs, shall appoint enough additional faculty members of appropriate rank from other Departments to create an evaluation committee of at least three.

- X. College-level Procedures.** When a recommendation for promotion or tenure is forwarded to the CASL Dean, it shall include all relevant papers (including offprints, books, etc.) and a record of the actual vote of the committee. Post facto unanimous ballots are not acceptable. The Dean shall make the dossiers available to members of the CASL Executive Committee, in its role as CASL Promotion and Tenure Committee, and shall call and chair all meetings devoted to these matters. If some members of the regular CASL Executive Committee hold ranks lower than those required for participation in such considerations, the Committee must be reconstituted. For policies and procedures, please see the CASL Bylaws, Article III.4. With the exception of the Dean of CASL,

full-time administrators or those who have been involved in promotion and tenure considerations because of administrative responsibilities shall not be eligible to serve on the reconstituted CASL Executive Committee.

The Chair shall accompany the Department evaluation committee's statements with his/her own comments, especially explaining how the Chair's opinions and recommendations may differ from those of the committee as a whole. If a Chair or the Dean should decide to make recommendations not approved by the evaluation committee, he/she must make clear that this is being done in his/her capacity as an administrator and not as chairperson of the committee. Recommendations at each level should include as much information as possible, within reason, relevant to each promotion and/or tenure recommendation. Chairs and the Dean will ordinarily not vote on such recommendations except in cases of ties. If either should decide not to vote, the recommendation would fail for want of a majority.

In deliberations at both the Department and College levels, voting shall be by secret, written ballot, and except in the obvious case of unanimous votes, no one shall discuss how he/she voted or what the final vote was. The Dean is required to inform the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, in writing, of the exact vote at the Department and College level.

Approved recommendations for promotion and/or tenure shall be forwarded, by the Dean, along with all relevant papers, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Faculty members shall be informed in writing of the results of the evaluation in relation to promotion considerations. They should be given timely notice of Departmental decisions by their Chair, so that they might appeal the decision to the College Executive Committee if they believe improper procedures were followed, they have been discriminated against, their academic freedom has been violated, or their treatment has been illegal or manifestly unfair.

The Dean shall promptly apprise the Department Chairs of the decisions reached by the CASL Executive Committee on faculty in their respective Departments. The Dean shall inform the faculty members concerned of these decisions. Since this is only one step in a long, complicated process, which could later be overturned, the Dean and others involved should not make public announcements about the results until the process is completed. It is of course understood that all "decisions" at the Department and College levels are simply recommendations to higher levels in the promotion/tenure chain, which goes through the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (in consultation with the members of the Faculty Senate), the Chancellor, the President (in consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs), and the Board of Regents.

Finally, if the CASL Executive Committee should vote not to recommend a nominated faculty member for promotion and/or tenure, the member may appeal the decision to the Dean. Detailed procedures for handling appeals for decisions within the College are explained in a separate document.

APPENDIX I

A SYSTEM FOR THE EVALUATION OF FULL PROFESSORS IN THE COLLEGE OF ARTS, SCIENCES, AND LETTERS

A. **Background.** The College of Arts, Sciences, and Letters (CASL) provides for the periodic evaluation of Full Professors, even though they are no longer subject to decisions on promotion and tenure. This periodic review is designed to give incentive for continued professional development in the senior faculty and will be used, along with yearly assessments by Department Chairs and other administrators, to determine salary increments and other benefits based on merit. The grounds for determining these benefits should be consistent with existing bases for determining promotion and tenure.

A previous statement on the evaluation of Full Professors was approved by the CASL Governing Faculty on 28 April 1978. The following is essentially an updating, to be made an official part of the CASL Guidelines as an appendix, in the light of the experiences and actual practice from 1978 to 1984.

B. **Policies and Procedures.**

(1) Each Professor shall submit to his/her Department Chair (along with all other full-time faculty) an annual report on his/her activities during the preceding twelve months--publications (including textbooks), presentations, service, teaching (including new courses, new methods, etc.) These reports shall be prepared in the format developed in the various Departments and consistent with College policies and shall be submitted by the deadlines set by the Departments. On the occasion of the Professor's periodic evaluation, he/she is required to synthesize these annual reports since promotion to Professor or since the last review, for use by the Ad Hoc College Committee.

(2) Professors teaching at least half time in the College shall be evaluated by the Ad Hoc College Committee of their peers at intervals of not less than four nor more than six years. The CASL Administration Office shall keep records on these evaluations, and the Dean shall determine early in each Fall term who is to be evaluated that year and shall inform in writing those Professors who will be evaluated toward the end of the next Winter term. When making decisions, the Dean shall keep in mind such factors as the time since the evaluation or promotion, administrative appointments, sabbaticals, leaves of absence, etc.

(3) Although some overlapping in the membership of the Committee from year to year should be effected, the Committee is not a standing committee and shall be called the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation of CASL Full Professors. The Committee members shall be chosen and appointed by the Dean, and the Dean shall call and chair all meetings. The names of the members shall be communicated to the Professors to be evaluated before the membership of the committee is made final, and the Dean may make changes if it becomes clear that serious problems in any member's objectivity might arise.

(4) The Committee shall consist of not fewer than four nor more than six faculty members. Although most of the members shall be Professors, there must be at least one tenured

Associate Professor on the committee. There must be at least one member from each Department represented by those who will be evaluated. At least three Departments shall be represented, and members from one Department may not constitute more than half of the Committee. In unusual circumstances, a qualified Professor in the discipline of one being evaluated--and acceptable to the Professor--may be appointed from outside the College.

(5) The Dean shall be responsible for the collection of all relevant materials--updated curriculum vitae, offprints, copies of books, etc.--from the Professors to be evaluated and for making them available in his/her office to members of the Ad Hoc Committee. In consultation with the Committee members, the Dean shall determine the two members who shall have the primary responsibility for drafting the evaluation letter for the Professor assigned to them. One of these must be from the evaluated Professor's Department. The Dean shall also explain the procedures to be followed and, in consultation with the members, the deadlines for the various steps. It should be made clear that the individual statements of evaluations shall be developed, revised, and finally approved by the Committee members. The Dean shall be only the facilitator, and shall be responsible for the format, preparation, and mailing of the final letter (the body of which shall be the Committee's evaluation) to the individual Professor concerned, with a copy to the Professor's Chair.

(6) The Committee's evaluation should contain comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the Professor's performance in the traditional three areas--teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service. As to weaknesses, the evaluation should be specific, suggest remedies, and, in extreme cases, may recommend a special evaluation for the following year. The Professor may respond to the Committee in writing regarding the evaluation and may discuss it with the Dean. An objection might lead to (a) a review by the Committee, with a possible revised letter, (b) the Committee's standing by its original letter and the filing of the Professor's letter in his/her Department's personnel file on the faculty member, or (c) an appeal.

(7) Any Professor who, even after a discussion with the Dean and a revised letter from the Committee, feels unfairly treated and judged in the process described above may appeal to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for a review by an ad hoc committee to be comprised chiefly of appropriate members of the Faculty Senate. The members would all be Professors, one of whom would be a Professor in the same discipline as the appellant but from another campus, all to be chosen by the Vice Chancellor. It should be kept in mind that this would be only an evaluation review, not a hearing, and that there would be no consideration of possible termination. The new evaluation of this review committee would be final.

APPENDIX II

GUIDELINES FOR CHOOSING OUTSIDE EVALUATORS OF FACULTY RESEARCH

In considering faculty candidates for tenure and for promotion to the rank of Associate or Full Professor, many of the nation's most prestigious universities make regular use of outside evaluators. That practice is now also standard at all three campuses of The University of Michigan.

The research materials of each candidate must be reviewed by at least five outside evaluators (including at least two from among those recommended by the candidate) chosen by the departmental promotion and tenure committee. The candidate will be notified of any evaluator not selected from the candidate's list and may comment on the choice but, of course, has no right to veto the promotion and tenure committee's decision.

It is important that the evaluators not be asked to advise on the tenure/promotion actions, but rather be invited to pass judgment on the published papers and other materials resulting from scholarly activity. Those chosen for this purpose should have the scholarly credentials to enable them to offer an objective expert opinion, and in general they ought to come from institutions of high calibre, where research and publication are appropriately esteemed. Ordinarily, they should be scholars whose work is not closely identified with that of the candidate, for example, as a dissertation advisor or as a coauthor. It is the responsibility of the candidate to make known any special association or relationship with the evaluator.

The evaluations should be regarded as advisory rather than binding, since the final responsibility for assessing research, as well as for assessing teaching and service, remains with promotion committees and the appropriate administrative officers of UM-Dearborn and the University.

The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
The University of Michigan-Dearborn