



MEMORANDUM

August 19, 2020

TO: Chancellor Debasish Dutta
University of Michigan - Flint

Chancellor Domenico Grasso
University of Michigan - Dearborn

FROM: Alexandra Matish *Alexandra Matish*
Associate Vice Provost and Senior Director
Academic Human Resources

SUBJECT: Recommendations for Instructional Promotions, 2021-22

Non-Discrimination Review of Promotion and Tenure Decisions -
Instructional Tenure Track, Research Professor Track, and Clinical
Instructional Track Faculty

The attached instructions set forth detailed procedures and requested format for submitting promotion casebooks. All casebooks should be submitted no later than **February 10, 2021**. I ask that you make every effort to meet this deadline. Instructional tenure track faculty promotion recommendations will be acted upon by the Regents at their May 2021c meeting. Promotion casebooks for Research Professors will be reported at the Regents' May meeting, along with Clinical faculty promotions.

For your reference, I have attached a copy of the Regental guidelines on "Qualifications for Appointment and Promotion in the Several Faculties of the University of Michigan" (Attachment A), which is particularly relevant to the preparation of promotion casebooks for Instructional tenure track faculty. I would remind you, and ask you to remind your chairs and promotion committees, that **no recommendation for Instructional tenure track faculty promotion or tenure is final until approved by the Regents**. Any announcement prior to that date is premature and is not appropriate. I would also like to remind you that it is the responsibility of the campus to contact individual faculty regarding a negative decision for promotion.

With respect to the broader process of promotion and tenure review, please note that units should attend carefully to potential COI issues in the assignment of faculty to promotion and tenure review panels or committees and throughout the review process.

With respect to the broader process of promotion and tenure review, please note that units should attend carefully to potential COI issues in the assignment of faculty to promotion and tenure review panels or committees and throughout the review process.

Producing these materials requires a substantial amount of work, your careful attention to the attached instructions is appreciated. I would like to re-emphasize that the President must have a consistent basis for review of recommendations from many different units and disciplines. I am, therefore, requesting that each individual casebook be accompanied by a signed cover letter from the Dean or Director. This letter should provide an **accurate, thorough, and balanced summary** of the casebook and the promotion review in the unit. **Please highlight both the pros and cons, strengths and weaknesses, of the faculty member's record and explain the rationale for the decision to recommend promotion.** In addition, I request a 2-3 sentence assessment from the dean on what substantive impact the faculty member's research or scholarly work has had either within their own field(s) or more broadly.

For those faculty with relevant activities, we ask that you comment on his/her contributions to interdisciplinary teaching. We also encourage you to recognize entrepreneurial, creative, and outreach activities as outlined in the attached memo. Additionally, many of our faculty engage in collaborative research, a practice strongly encouraged by the University. To acknowledge the contributions of these faculty, it is essential that schools/colleges document in the faculty member's casebook his/her specific expertise and contribution(s) to collaborative research that indicate research independence.

Please note that only one casebook is required for faculty being promoted in two or more units. In these instances, it is important that the units coordinate their casebook preparations, which will include a cover letter signed by all the respective Dean(s). In the event the faculty candidate is not recommended for promotion and tenure in a unit(s) in which he/she holds a title, the cover letter should clearly indicate the reason(s) for this decision. Additional details are given in the attached instructions (Item #3.b. in the Checklist).

For each faculty member being promoted on the Instructional tenure track or Research Professor track, at least five "arm's length" external review letters are required, and more are highly desirable. We do not consider teachers, advisors, mentors, and current faculty colleagues to be "arm's length." Co-authors and major research collaborators/former faculty colleagues are also not "arm's length" unless the most recent association occurred over 10 years prior to the promotion. Please note that for the Clinical Instructional track only, we will accept up to two of these review letters from University of Michigan faculty who have seen the clinical work and actual teaching but are neither mentors nor scholarly collaborators nor in the same department as the candidate. If you have any questions about the application of this requirement, please contact our office as soon as the question arises (Item #3.j. in the Checklist).

Academic units must forward materials to the President on each decision not to recommend tenure. The cases that must be forwarded are those in which the faculty member will receive a terminal

contract without expectation of further review. Those being deferred for review to another year should not be sent to us. The materials forwarded on a negative mandatory tenure case should include the same materials that are submitted for a positive promotion and tenure case, with one exception: all negative mandatory tenure cases require an updated curriculum vitae, in addition to the original curriculum vitae. This should be a CV that has been updated to reflect the candidate's academic productivity at the time of the campus level of review. It is essential that the cover letter present a concise but complete and unbiased accounting of all aspects of the case and make clear the reasons for the negative recommendation. All documents created as part of the promotion process and relied upon in reaching a negative mandatory tenure recommendation should be included in the casebook and uploaded to M-Box.

Wise and objective decisions about appointment, promotion, and tenure are essential to the overall quality of the institution. The conferring of tenure represents long-term intellectual and financial commitments by the University. In fact, it may be the single most important responsibility that we have. I appreciate your efforts and success in attracting and retaining the very best faculty. Your attention to these guidelines will greatly assist the President in this critical decision-making process. **Please forward this memorandum and the attached instructions to Deans who are directly responsible for the promotional review of Instructional tenure track, Research Professor track, and Clinical Instructional track faculty.**

Your attention to this important process is greatly appreciated.

ASM/td

Attachments

cc: Mark Schlissel
S. Feist-Price
S. Alcock
R. Holcomb
J. Hubbard
D. Blaga
T. Sedgeman

2021
Outline of Procedures for Faculty Promotions
(Effective 2020-2021)

GENERAL NOTES:

- All promotion recommendations for Instructional tenure track faculty, Research Professor track faculty, and Clinical Instructional track faculty are reviewed by the Provost and President prior to submission to the Board of Regents.
- Please upload a bookmarked PDF to M-Box by **Wednesday, February 10, 2021**. **The effective date for these promotions will be September 1, 2021.**
- To the extent possible, the University brings all recommendations for promotion in academic rank to the Board of Regents in May of each year. In addition to reviewing individual promotions for Instructional tenure track faculty, this affords the Regents an opportunity to review the overall promotional pattern for faculty in the University. It is also desirable for promotions to be considered by the various units in a group to ensure that a common frame of reference will be used in making decisions. **It is therefore important to minimize the number of out-of-season promotions. Recommendations for promotions outside the normal cycle should be restricted to exception cases and/or circumstances, which are to be explained in the cover letter accompanying the file. Please note that, given the challenges of managing out of season promotions, the timeline for disposition of such cases cannot be guaranteed.**
- The attached instructions apply to Instructional tenure track, Research Professor track, and Clinical Instructional track faculty promotions, all of which require approval by the Provost and the President, and approval by the appropriate Chancellor for Flint or Dearborn faculty. Differences among the tracks are noted in the appropriate sections below.
- All Research Faculty promotions also require the review of the Vice President for Research.
- Promotions for Associate Research Scientists and Research Scientists require the approval of the Vice President for Research and do not require the Provost's or President's approval.
- All Medical School promotions must also have the endorsement of the Executive Vice President for Medical Affairs.
- The review and signature of the Dean of the school/college or Director of an institute are required on all recommended promotions.
- Promotion recommendations for individuals holding joint regular (not adjunct) Instructional tenure track, Research Professor track, or Clinical Instructional track faculty appointments should be coordinated. They require the signatures of the Chancellor/Deans/Directors from all campuses/schools/colleges where the individual holds instructional appointments, even if those are dry appointments. **Only one casebook should be prepared for a faculty member with joint appointments.** The cover letter for each joint appointment casebook should be signed by all of the appropriate Chancellor/Dean(s)/Director(s). This letter should describe the processes used in each school or college to reach a promotion recommendation, as well as a description of the ways in which the two (or more) schools and colleges coordinated their promotion processes in this case. If the individual is not recommended for promotion in any of the units in which he/she holds an appointment, the cover letter should clearly indicate the reason(s) for this decision.

- The relative weighing, and hence the detail required, for each of the items (a-1) in the documentation for each candidate (Item #3) will vary across the different faculty tracks. However, all files must include documentation of teaching effectiveness and of research or creative work. A copy of the University of Michigan Bylaws for Clinical Instructional Staff (Sec. 5.23) and for Research Professors (Sec. 5.24) is attached for your information (Attachment B).

Instructions for Research Scientist faculty promotion recommendations are included in a separate document for your information. Additional details are available on the Office of Research (UMOR) website: <https://www.research.umich.edu/promotion-procedures-research-scientists>.

**CHECKLIST FOR
FACULTY PROMOTION CASEBOOKS**

Please upload a bookmarked PDF file of the following materials for each casebook to the designated
M-Box folder by
Wednesday, February 10, 2021

For further information,
contact Tina Sedgeman in the Office of the Provost, tsedge@umich.edu or 764-0151.

1. Summary Memorandum from Dean/Director

- The Dean/Director should include a summary memorandum indicating the names of all individuals being recommended for promotion and the promotion action.
- For a Research Professor track appointment, the summary memorandum from the Dean/Director should be addressed to both the Provost and the Vice President for Research.
- The summary memorandum must include an Employee ID number for each individual being recommended for promotion.
- For faculty holding joint appointments (including Instructional tenure track, Research Professor track, and Clinical Instructional track appointments), please include details of the recommendation from each unit in which they hold an appointment.
- Please upload to the M-Box folder the signed summary memorandum as a separate PDF document.

2. Unit Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service

- Address how your school/college and the various promoting departments, programs, or other units define and evaluate teaching, research, and service in their areas. If there are material differences in the criteria used by different areas in your school/college to evaluate candidates for promotion, please describe these (e.g., external funding is an important criterion in some disciplines; in others, it is not).

3. Documentation for each Candidate:

a. For Instructional Tenure Track Faculty Only: A Copy of the Promotion Recommendation – see Attachment C (format) and Attachment D (samples)

- This document, which is prepared for the Regents, should present a brief assessment of the overall performance and achievements of the individual being recommended.
- Include information about the individual's contribution in the context of the unit's mission.
- Prior to obtaining the Dean/Directors' final signature(s), submit an electronic draft of the Promotion Recommendation to Tammy Deane (trendell@umich.edu) for review.
- The signed Promotion Recommendation should be upload to the Promotion Recommendation M-Box folder. If you have questions, please contact Tammy Deane (936-8911 or trendell@umich.edu) for clarification.
- Put the date **May 2021** at the end of this document.

b. Cover Letter from the Dean/Director

- Provide a subject line with the candidate's name, all current titles, Employee ID number, and include the date of hire for all cases.
- If the candidate holds joint appointments, please indicate the fraction of effort for each title - for example, Associate Professor, without tenure (100%), and Research Associate Professor (0%).
- Indicate both the total years in rank for the current appointment and the years in rank at Michigan. Please note that to be consistent among all schools/colleges, the years in rank should include the year of the promotion review.
- **Time in rank is not prescriptive: putting faculty forward for promotion should be based on individual achievements. Likewise, units should insure that approved tenure clock extensions or exclusions are not counted against a candidate.**
- Indicate whether any of the candidate's years of service have been excluded from the tenure clock for childbirth, dependent care, medical or other reasons. For privacy reasons (HIPAA - the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996), please do not provide details of the reason behind a medical leave.
- Where appropriate, for promotion casebooks from the health sciences schools and colleges, provide an estimate of time (%) dedicated to clinical care.
- The assessment should be written from an evaluative, not an advocacy, perspective and should present a balanced summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the case. Be sure to discuss any negative reports or reviews included in the casebook.
- **Provide a 2-3 sentence assessment on what substantive impact the candidate's research or scholarly work has had either within their own field or more broadly.**
- It is important that non-traditional forms of scholarly production are given as much scrutiny as the more traditional/disciplinary work. It is important to ensure that individuals receive full credit for their contributions to interdisciplinary and/or collaborative scholarly projects.
- As appropriate, please account for any entrepreneurial, outreach, or creative activities in which faculty engage that may enhance the criteria on which faculty are measured – teaching, research, and service. These activities may include involvement with other sectors, including public or private organizations, that have not traditionally been considered in faculty evaluations, or they may include creative activity that does not take the form of traditional scholarship.
- **Dean's letters should focus on pros and cons, strengths and weaknesses, of the case & account clearly for the tenor of the unit's discussion and voting.**
- Describe the outcome of the promotion review at each stage of evaluation in the unit(s) in which the candidate holds an appointment. We understand that all cases require careful consideration of strengths and weaknesses; please summarize the evaluative comments of each unit's promotion review committee and/or executive committee and include the final vote tally (such as 4-2 – no names) of any faculty group (department review, promotion advisory committee, and/or executive committee) that voted on the promotion recommendation. If a departmental decision is reversed or a recommendation rejected by the school/college, explain the reversal or rejection in detail.
- Explain your reasons for recommending or not recommending promotion and tenure.
- Highlight and discuss **in detail** any special circumstances concerning this individual (e.g., early promotion request).
- When quoting from an external reviewer, identify as Reviewer A, B, or C, etc. Be sure to exclude identifying information (e.g., the reviewer's institution).
- The cover letter should be signed by the Dean(s)/Director(s) from all units in which the candidate is being promoted.

c. Chair's letter (if any)

- Please provide any letters or reports from department or division chairs to the Dean/Director or school/college recommending a decision for or against promotion. If the recommendation is at odds with the decision of a sub-unit or a review committee, that should be explained.
- Also required for secondary appointment recommendations, with or without tenure.

d. Curriculum Vitae

- Check the accuracy, completeness, and timeliness of the information in the curriculum vitae, (e.g., that publications listed as "in press" are really in press and that the degrees indicated have been awarded).
- All negative mandatory tenure cases require an updated curriculum vitae, in addition to the original CV. (i.e., a CV that has been updated to reflect the candidate's academic productivity at the time of the Provost's level of review).

e. Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness

- While recognizing that different cultures prevail in different units with respect to the nature and the evaluation of teaching, the University places a high value on providing students with an outstanding educational experience. We strongly encourage units to develop and utilize teaching portfolios. (See Attachment E for an explanation of teaching portfolios.)
- If the unit chooses to include copies of course syllabi, include no more than two courses.
- Teaching evaluations (i.e., E&E evaluations) should be summarized in this section, so we are providing a template, some version of which should be included in each casebook.
 - As noted in the July 9, 2019 email sent on behalf of Vice Provost Pierce and Vice Provost Blair, please display each E&E question schools, colleges, and academic units ask (i.e., core, required, and optional questions) for each faculty member in its own column in the table submitted with that faculty member's T&P case (see template table below). Please also display responses for each question in individual rows for each term's courses and sections of courses (e.g., in the event a faculty member has teaching roles in multiple sections of a single course in a single term). For each optional question asked, please include a brief explanation for its inclusion.
 - A summary evaluation sheet listing all questions for each course may also be included, as well as other information (e.g., averages for particular E&E questions). In addition, comparative data is particularly helpful. However, these materials are supplemental to, and not replacements for, the information in the tables.
 - Do not include individual student feedback from the E&E forms, though we reserve the right to request individual evaluations by students. Student letters solicited by an evaluating committee can be helpful, but letters solicited by the candidate from students are not helpful. Peer evaluations following observation of classes should be included if they exist.
- If the candidate has not taught formal classes and if teaching evaluations are not available for a promotion on the Research Professor track, provide 3-5 letters from mentees, not currently under the candidate's supervision (e.g., former post-doc students), who can provide feedback on the candidate's teaching.

TEMPLATE:

Courses Taught at UM and Evaluations

- As noted in Vice Provost Pierce's message from October 31, 2017, prior to FA16 there were four (4) required "core" questions:
 - Q1 – Overall, this was an excellent course;
 - Q2 – Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher;
 - Q3 – I learned a great deal from this course; and

Q4 – I had a strong desire to take this course

- Beginning September 1, 2016, Q4 continued as a core question. However, Q1, Q2, and Q3 were replaced effective FA16 as “core” questions by the following seven (7) questions, taken from the Registrar’s Office Question Catalog:
 - Q891 (Modified) – As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was... (SA = Much Lighter, A = Lighter, N = Typical, D = Heavier, SD = Much Heavier)
 - Q1631 – This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter (Q1631 was specifically intended to replace Q3);
 - Q1632 – My interest in the subject has increased because of this course;
 - Q1633 – I knew what was expected of me in this course;
 - Q230 – The instructor seemed well prepared for class meetings;
 - Q199 – The instructor explained material clearly; and
 - Q217 – The instructor treated students with respect
- While they are no longer part of the core set, Q1 and Q2 will continue to be required through FA20.
- Beginning Winter 2021, Q1 and Q2 will be optional.
- For more information, please visit the Office of the Registrar website: <https://ro.umich.edu/faculty-staff/teaching-evaluations>

E&E Template Table (revise as needed to include E&E questions asked)

Course #	Course Title	Teaching Role*	Term	Enrollment/ Responses (#s only)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q199	Q217	Q230	Q891	Q1631	Q1632	Q1633

*Instructor or Co-Instructor

- Please include the candidate’s own teaching statement.
- For faculty with relevant activities, please comment on their contributions to interdisciplinary teaching.
- All files, whether for Instructional tenure track, Research Professor track, or Clinical Instructional track, must provide evidence of teaching effectiveness. Where teaching takes place outside the traditional classroom, explain the context in which it occurs and how it is evaluated in terms of both quantity and quality.
- The relevant criterion of teaching effectiveness for the ranks of Research Professor and Research Associate Professor is: Record of teaching and mentoring within the context of one or more research programs (e.g., laboratory bench science, social science, or other disciplinary setting) with postdoctoral fellows, junior research colleagues, or students at any level. Teaching and mentoring are measured in two ways: 1) Quantity (i.e., that there should be evidence of a significant amount of teaching and/or mentoring), and 2) Quality (i.e., that the teaching and/or mentoring done by the individual is effective and has significant impact on the students, fellows, and colleagues being taught). Documentation/evidence to support a candidate’s account of teaching and mentoring activities will vary, depending on the nature of the individual’s activities, *but documentation of quantity and quality must be included*. In all cases, students and mentees include, but are not limited to, undergraduate students, graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and junior research colleagues.

f. Documentation of Research (if appropriate) or Creative Work (if appropriate)

- Please provide a brief description of the candidate's most significant research finding or creative contributions. Keep in mind that this will be read by non-specialists and needs to be accessible to a broad audience. Convey a sense of the candidate's subfield of scholarship or artistic expression and of the candidate's place within that subfield. This discussion should enable the reader to understand the substance of the work and its importance. Potentially relevant topics include conventions of publication in the field, sources of external funding, expectations about co-authorship in research teams, norms about work with doctoral and post-doctoral mentors, significance of awards, and other topics as appropriate.
- For those faculty who engage in collaborative research, it is essential that schools/colleges document in the faculty member's casebook their specific expertise and contribution(s) to collaborative research that indicate research independence.
- For faculty with interdisciplinary appointments, please comment on their contributions to interdisciplinary activities with regard to research.
- For faculty with entrepreneurial, creative, and outreach activities, please comment on their contributions to these types of activities.
- Please include the candidate's own research statement.
- Include reviews of the candidate's research or creative work by internal or departmental committees (e.g., ad hoc committee, casebook committee, and/or promotion and tenure committee) and the candidate's response to the reviews, if any.
- Do not include copies of the original work, such as portfolios of drawings and photos, journal articles, other manuscripts, CDs, or DVDs (note: copies of any reviews of the candidate's books are acceptable). Do not include copies of grant applications.

g. Documentation of Service (if appropriate)

h. Sample of Letter Sent to External Reviewers to Solicit Recommendations

- Include a copy of the solicitation letter. See the text in the attached template (Attachments F-1 and F-4) that at a minimum must be used. Schools and colleges may add text to the language of the template, however, for legal reasons, **cannot delete or change any language**. It is the responsibility of the Dean/Director to ensure that department chairs, or the appropriate equivalent, follow one of the templates provided.
- There are four templates: one for an Instructional tenure track candidate who does not have interdisciplinary appointments (Attachment F-1), and one for an Instructional tenure track candidate who does have interdisciplinary appointments, which highlights promotion considerations based on interdisciplinary research (Attachment F-2). There are also templates for Clinical Instructional track candidates (Attachment F-3) and for Research Professor track candidates (F-4).

**i. Brief Description of the Credentials of External Reviewers and their Relationship to the Candidates
(Attachment G)**

In this section of the casebook, include a cover sheet that includes the following:

- A. A listing of "arm's length" external reviewers who provided review letters.
- B. A listing of "non-arm's length" external reviewers who provided review letters.
- C. A listing of external reviewers who were asked to write a letter but declined and the reason for declining.

For the above three categories:

- List all external reviewers alphabetically by last name.
- Identify all external reviewers in sequence as Reviewer A, B, C, D, E, etc.
- Include a brief bio on each reviewer.
- Designate each reviewer as “arm’s length” or “non-arm’s length”.
- Note whether the reviewer was suggested by the candidate or by the department.

Our goal is to receive evaluative letters from external reviewers who have been suggested by the candidate and from reviewers who have been suggested only by the department. For the Instructional tenure track and the Research Professor track, the five “arm’s length” required letters must include at least two from reviewers suggested only by the department. Note: this requirement of two external review letters (minimum) suggested only by the department is not applicable to the Clinical Instructional track.

External reviewers should be contacted only by the school/college/department. The candidate should not have contact with the external reviewers.

If a non-academic external reviewer is included as one of the five required “arm’s length” reviewers, provide justification that the title held by the reviewer equates to or is at a level above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered for promotion.

j. Evaluation Letters by all External Reviewers (at least five are required and more are highly desirable)

- All external review letters received must be included.
 - Please insert the abridged version of the reviewer’s biography (one short paragraph) in front of each external review letter. This is in addition to the required cover sheet listing external reviewers (Attachment G).
 - Include the designation of “arm’s length” or “non-arm’s length” and whether the reviewer was suggested by the candidate or by the school/department.
 - The external reviewers must hold a rank at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered for promotion. If the circumstances necessitate letters from out-of-rank reviewers, those should be explained.
 - In addition to the above rank requirement, the following track requirements apply:
 - External reviewers who are tenured faculty can review all promotion casebooks for the Instructional tenure track, Research Professor track, and Clinical Instructional track.
 - External reviewers who are Clinical Instructional track faculty can only review promotion casebooks for the Clinical Instructional track.
 - External reviewers who are Research Professor track faculty can only review promotion casebooks for the Research Professor track.
- Note: If, for example, an external reviewer who is a Clinical Instructional track faculty were to review an Instructional tenure track casebook, the letter from the reviewer would not be counted as one of the required five “arm’s length” letters.
- **There should be no more than two external reviewers from the same institution.**
 - We urge you to stress with your department chairs, or the appropriate equivalent, that the external letters must be evaluative and at “arm’s length.” Teachers, advisors, mentors, or current faculty colleagues are not “arm’s length.” Co-authors and major research collaborators/former faculty colleagues are also not “arm’s length” unless the most recent association occurred over 10 years prior to the promotion. We do not consider letters from persons who have served on a candidate’s thesis or dissertation committee to be “arm’s length.” While these kinds of letters can 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. Letters from persons who do not know the candidate, but who may have a clear sense of the significance of the candidate’s qualifications, are of greater value.

- Please note that 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 can be considered an “arm’s length” reviewer if he/she and the candidate have not personally interacted in the research effort. In these cases, we ask that the dean provide a statement noting the absence of a direct collaboration.
- It is important that the Clinical Instructional track parallel the Instructional tenure track and Research Professor track in that it is the regional/national impact on one’s field that should justify a senior academic rank. However, “arm’s length” letters from persons who do not know the candidate, but who have a clear sense of the significance of the candidate’s qualifications, are unlikely to tell the whole story insofar as teaching and clinical work are concerned. Therefore it would be reasonable, for Clinical Instructional track faculty only, to have up to two of the five “arm’s length” evaluative letters from University of Michigan faculty who have seen the clinical work and actual teaching but are neither mentors nor scholarly collaborators nor in the same department as the candidate. At least three of the remaining letters would need to be “arm’s length” as ordinarily defined.
- For questions about re-using the previous year’s external review letters from a candidate’s promotion casebook, please contact the appropriate vice provost.

k. Evaluation Letters by Internal (University of Michigan) Reviewers (optional)

- Internal review letters are not required; but if letters were solicited, they must be included. Internal review letters may be helpful if they are from faculty in other units who can attest to the value of a faculty member’s work, particularly interdisciplinary and clinical work (as noted above) and scholarship.

l. For Research Professor Track Promotions Only

- “Statement of Understanding Regarding Responsibility for Bridging Support.” (Attachment H)

4. Retention of Promotion and Tenure Files

- SPG 201.46 requires that promotion and tenure files be retained for a period of six years plus the current fiscal year in each candidate's departmental or unit personnel file.

5. Non-Discrimination Review of Promotion and Tenure Decisions

- The University is committed to ensuring that all individuals are treated fairly and are not disadvantaged because of their race, ethnicity, or gender. In reviewing faculty for promotions, schools and colleges are reminded of these responsibilities and are encouraged to consider such promotions carefully to ensure that neither rank nor tenure relationships are affected negatively by considerations of gender, race, age, or other irrelevant characteristics.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION IN THE SEVERAL FACULTIES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Since the University of Michigan is responsible for maintaining high standards of teaching, research, and service to the people of the state in a wide variety of fields, it is essential that its faculties be composed of men and women with superior personal and professional qualifications. The following statement is issued for the guidance of administrative officers and of other members of the staff who are responsible for ensuring that all persons appointed or promoted in the several faculties are thoroughly qualified to discharge the duties of their respective positions.

Teaching. Essential qualifications for appointment or promotion are character and the ability to teach, whether at the undergraduate or the graduate level. Some of the elements to be evaluated are experience, knowledge of subject matter, skill in presentation, interest in students, ability to stimulate youthful minds, capacity for cooperation, and enthusiastic devotion to teaching. The responsibility of the teacher as a guide and friend properly extends beyond the walls of the classroom into other phases of the life of the student as a member of the University community. It also involves the duty of initiating and improving educational methods both within and outside the departments.

Research. All members of the faculties must be persons of scholarly ability and attainments. Their qualifications are to be evaluated on the quality of their published and other creative work, the range and variety of their intellectual interests, their success in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods, and their participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals. Attainment may be in the realm of scientific investigation, in the realm of constructive contributions, or in the realm of the creative arts.

Service. The scope of the University's activities makes it appropriate for members of the staff to engage in many activities outside of the fields of teaching and research. These may include participation in committee work and other administrative tasks, counseling, clinical duties, and special training programs. The University also expects many of its staff to render extramural services to schools, to industry, to local, state, and national agencies, and to the public at large.

APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

In making their recommendation for either appointment or promotion, the responsible departments and colleges will study the whole record of each candidate. To warrant recommendation for initial appointment, candidates must have given evidence either here or elsewhere of their ability to handle satisfactorily the duties of the positions in question. To warrant recommendation for promotions, candidates must have shown superior ability in at least one phase of their activities and substantial contribution in other phases. Naturally, persons who make a distinguished contribution in all aspects of their work may expect more rapid promotion than persons of more limited achievement.

Promotion is not automatic nor does it simply depend on length of service. All promotions are recommended and made on the basis of demonstrated merit. The University endeavors to recognize distinguished performance by adequate increases in salary and early promotion. For this reason a call to another position is not by itself considered a sufficient reason for promotion but may be one of the factors to be taken into consideration in the timing of a promotion.

It is assumed that, as members of the staff mature in experience, they will become more effective teachers and scholars. To that extent the qualifications for appointment and promotion will be progressively more exacting at each successive rank. In particular, promotion to the rank of associate professor, which entails indeterminate tenure, will be approved only when a person has given such clear evidence of ability that they may be expected, in due season, to attain a professorship.

Sec. 5.24. Research Scientists and Research Professors (revised October 2003)

1. Research Scientists. An academic or research unit may appoint research scientists to support the research activities of the University if a policy to authorize such appointments has been adopted by the school, college, division, or research unit in accordance with the bylaws of that unit and has been approved by the vice president for research.

Research scientist appointments are not appointments to the tenured or tenure-track instructional faculty. The following titles may be used for research scientist appointments: research scientist, associate research scientist, assistant research scientist, and research investigator. Further definition of the rights and responsibilities of research scientists, not inconsistent with the Bylaws of the Board of Regents, may be addressed by the bylaws of the academic or research units.

Research scientist appointments and promotions are recommended by the appropriate instructional unit and school, college, division, or research unit and are approved by the vice president for research, the chancellor (Dearborn or Flint), and the president.

The vice president and secretary of the university shall maintain a list of those schools, colleges, divisions, and research units that are authorized to make research scientist appointments.

2. Research Professors. An academic or research unit may appoint research professors to support the research activities of the University if a policy to authorize such appointments has been adopted by the school, college, division, or research unit in accordance with the bylaws of that unit and has been approved by the vice president for research and the appropriate provost.

Research professor appointments are not appointments to the tenured or tenure-track instructional faculty. The following titles may be used for research professor appointments: research professor, research associate professor, and research assistant professor. Further definition of the rights and responsibilities of research professors, not inconsistent with the Bylaws of the Board of Regents, may be addressed by the bylaws of the academic or research units.

Research professor appointments and promotions are recommended by the appropriate instructional unit and school, college, division, or research unit and are approved by the vice president for research, the appropriate provost, the chancellor (Dearborn or Flint), and the president.

The vice president and secretary of the university shall maintain a list of those schools, colleges, divisions, and research units that are authorized to make research professor appointments.

Instructions for Instructional Tenure Track Faculty Promotion Recommendations

An outline of the format to be used for promotion recommendations is attached. Each recommendation should be at least three (3) pages, not exceeding five (5) pages. The promotion recommendations for **Instructional tenure track faculty** will be presented to the Regents as electronic files; therefore, we ask that you submit these files electronically to Tammy Deane via the MBox. The electronic file should be an exact replica of the original printed version (**including** the signature).

The tenure status (with or without) for promotions to associate and full professor must be indicated. Also, if a faculty member has a joint Instructional appointment in your school/college or in another unit of the University, please supply this information on the recommendation. Any other titles that do not need the approval of the Regents, such as adjunct professor, research scientist, etc., should be listed under the Professional Record section of the promotional material. If the individual is being recommended for “tenure” only (without a change in title), please use the wording “is recommended for the granting of tenure to be held with his/her title of (insert title).”

FORMAT FOR PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION FOR INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION

The University of Michigan

SCHOOL/COLLEGE OF _____
DEPARTMENT OF _____

(Name), (Present Instructional Rank), (Complete Instructional Title[s]), with (or without) tenure, (Department or Unit), (School/College) is recommended for promotion to (Recommended Instructional Rank), (Complete Instructional Title[s]), with (or without) tenure, (Department or Unit/School/ College).

(NOTE: This paragraph would not include adjunct, supplemental or professional/ administrative titles the individual might hold. Please include all joint Instructional appointments they may hold within your school/college or other schools/colleges.)

Academic Degrees (List highest degree first, in descending order: e.g., Ph.D., M.S., B.S.)

Professional Record: (Please include all titles held at the University of Michigan, at other universities, and other professional affiliations, with the most current title listed first.)

20__-20__ Associate Professor, University of Michigan
20__-20__ Assistant Professor, University of Michigan
19__-20__ Assistant Professor, other university

Summary of Evaluation:

Teaching:

- Provide a broad assessment of teaching.
- Describe the variety of non-classroom teaching venues that are part of the Instructional environment.
- Explain the significance of the candidate's role in curriculum innovation, initiatives and design.

Research:

- List most significant publications and highlight recent publications (since last promotion). Include a prediction as to the candidate's future productivity and contributions to the discipline, the unit, and the University.
- Carefully explicate the disciplinary and interdisciplinary culture within which the scholarly work is produced.
- Explain the significance of the candidate's role in multiple authorship situations.

Service:

- Provide a general description of the contribution.
- List specific examples.

External Review: Summarize the comments of at least five external peer reviewers. (To maintain the confidentiality of the external peer reviewers, identify the reviewer by using the designation "Reviewer A, B, C," etc. - see Attachment G.)

Summary of Recommendation: Provide an overall assessment of performance and achievements in the context of the mission of the unit.

(Signature - in black ink)
(Name, title of chancellor/dean)
(school/college/campus)

(Signature - in black ink)
(Name, title of chancellor/dean)
(Second signature for joint appointments)

SAMPLE PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION
The University of Michigan
College of Engineering
Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science

John C. Doe, associate professor of electrical engineering and computer science, with tenure, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, College of Engineering, is recommended for promotion to professor of electrical engineering and computer science, with tenure, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, College of Engineering. **(See additional samples of this first paragraph at the end of this sample promotion recommendation.)**

Academic Degrees:

Ph.D. 1997 University of Illinois, Computer Science, Urbana-Champaign
M.S. 1993 University of Illinois, Computer Science, Urbana-Champaign
B.S. 1991 Duke University, Physics and Computer Science, Durham, NC

Professional Record:

2007 – present Associate Professor (with tenure), Department of Electrical Engineering and
Computer Science, University of Michigan
2000 – 2008 Engineering Manager, Advanced Design Technology, Motorola, Inc., Austin, TX
1998 – 2000 Staff Engineer, Semiconductor Systems Design Technology Group, Motorola, Inc.,
Austin, TX
1997 – 1998 Development Staff Member, IBM Corporation, Endicott, NY

Summary of Evaluation:

Teaching: Professor Doe is an excellent educator, both inside and outside of the classroom. He has taught a range of courses, from a large lower-level course on logic design that is required for all undergraduates in computer engineering, to an upper-level undergraduate course on VLSI (very large scale integrated) circuit design, and an advanced graduate course on VLSI that involves a very sizeable design project, to which he brings his considerable industrial experience. He has also introduced and taught special topics courses on two occasions. His performance in the classroom has yielded very high student evaluations, with Q1 scores ranging from 4.22 to 4.79, and Q2 scores between 4.30 and 4.77. He puts significant effort into class preparation and into helping his students learn, and this is highly respected and appreciated by those students

Professor Doe is also an outstanding mentor. Since joining the university in 2005, he has graduated eight Ph.D. students, with three more expected to graduate before the end of 2016. In addition, he has advised several Master's Degree students, many of whom have contributed directly to his research projects and publications. He currently has a research group comprised of approximately ten students.

Professor Doe's skill and enthusiasm were recognized with the 2009 University of Michigan Henry Russel Award for "Exceptional Scholarship and Conspicuous Ability as a Teacher."

Research: Professor Doe is a nationally and internationally renowned leader in the field of low-power robust VLSI circuit design. When he came to Michigan in 2005, he had already established himself as one of the leading researchers in VLSI. At Michigan, he continued the work he had begun at Motorola on timing analysis of digital circuits, signal integrity, and power distribution within integrated circuits. He has also initiated research projects on several new topics, including low power and robust systems. His work on producing robust digital systems that can tolerate the non-determinism that creeps into highly miniaturized logic devices has been particularly influential in the

field. He has also recently begun a cross-disciplinary collaboration with the Kellogg Eye Center to place a very low power processor and pressure sensor in the human eye.

Professor Doe is an extraordinarily prolific researcher: in the eleven years since coming to Michigan, he has published approximately 150 papers in journals and strongly refereed conferences. Moreover, the quality of these papers is very high, with four winning best paper prizes and several more being nominated for them. He has also obtained eight patents and has four more pending. He has raised over \$4,000,000 in research support, counting only his share of collaborative projects. Further evidence of the impact of his work is provided by the large number of industrial seminars that he has been invited to present at corporations including Intel, Philips, ARM, Toyota, Nvidia, and Synopsys, amongst others.

Recent and Significant Publications:

- Quaker Oats, Steve Sunshine, Dennis Silver, John Doe, “Statistical Interconnect Metrics for Physical-Design Optimization,” *Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems (T-CAD)*, Vol. 25, No. 7, July 2015, pg. 1273 - 1288.
- Bruce Lee, Greg Heaven, John Doe, Dennis Silver, “Bus Encoding for Total Power Reduction using a Leakage-Aware Buffer Configuration,” *IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration Systems (T-VLSI)*, December 2014, pg. 1376-1383.
- Bo Wrap, John Doe, Dennis Silver, Fish Flunder, “The Limit of Dynamic Voltage Scaling and Insomniac Dynamic Voltage Scaling,” *IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration Systems (T-VLSI)*, November 2014, pg. 1239-1252.
- John Lee, John Doe, Dennis Silver, “Static Leakage Reduction through Simultaneous V_{DD} and State Assignment,” *Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems (T-CAD)*, Vol. 24, No. 7, July 2013, pg. 1014-1029.
- Steve Sunshine, Brown Bear, John Doe, Dennis Silver, “Parametric Yield Estimation Considering Leakage Variability,” ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (DAC), June 2012, pg. 442-447, Best Paper Nomination.
- Dan Neat, Singing Kim, Dave Downtown, Blue Pant, Todd Farm, Steve Sunshine, Conrad Belt, John Doe, Brown Beat, Greg Gray, “Razor: A Low-Power Pipeline Based on Circuit-Level Timing Speculation,” ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO), December 2011, pg. 7-18, Best Paper Award.

Service: Professor Doe performs extensive professional service, as befits a professor. He is an associate editor for a major IEEE publication; has served multiple times as the co-chair of the technical program for one of the leading computer hardware conferences; and, has served as a member of the technical program committee and/or executive committee for dozens of major conferences over the past few years. Internally, he has been a chair and member of the EECS Undergraduate Committee, as well as the Graduate Admissions Committee, and he served as an undergraduate advisor.

External Reviewers:

Reviewer A: “He is highly sought after and I am certain that he would have no difficulty in obtaining a faculty position at the rank of full professor at the top 5 Universities in the country.”

Reviewer B: “John is an outstanding researcher and has been recognized for his contributions to the fields of high-performance and low-power integrated circuit design methodology and computer-aided design tools.”

Reviewer C: “Overall, Prof Doe has addressed relevant problems and achieved significant scientific accomplishments.”

Reviewer D: “When serving as an external evaluator of a case for promotion to Professor, I look for three things: significant contributions in more than one research area, successful PhD students graduated, and leadership service to one’s profession. John clearly gets an A in research

contributions. John also gets an A in leadership service to his profession. He has graduated three PhD students to date with a whole slew in the pipeline...they are well prepared and have worked on challenging and forward looking project [sic] for their dissertation research.”

Reviewer E: “He is exceptionally creative, with both an uncanny feel for what should work, as well as the drive to make it work.”

Reviewer F: “He has become one of the global leaders in the field of advanced integrated circuits and the associated design methodologies, and is bound to do his department pride [sic].”

Reviewer G: “...he is a world-class researcher and is a real asset to any top class University.”

Reviewer H: “He has a broad portfolio of first-rate research publications in this general area [chip-level large-scale analysis and optimization], including some very prominent Best Paper Awards and nominations...”

Reviewer I: “It is particularly notable that his work has been widely cited by other researchers, and much of it has been put into practice in industry...”

Reviewer J: “John’s research in low-power design is of exceptional quality. I have seen his work cited extensively in journals and conference papers everywhere.”

Reviewer K: “...one of the most outstanding researchers and recognized names in the VLSI CAD and design automation community worldwide.”

Summary of Recommendation: Professor Doe is a very prominent and very productive computer engineer who has made significant contributions to the field of VLSI CAD. He is an excellent teacher and mentor; and he is a leader who contributes both in external and internal service. It is with the support of the College of Engineering Executive Committee that I recommend John C. Doe for promotion to professor of electrical engineering and computer science, with tenure, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, College of Engineering.

Alec D. Gallimore, Ph.D.
Robert J. Vlasic Dean of Engineering
College of Engineering

May 2021

THE TEACHING PORTFOLIO

Matthew Kaplan

At institutions across the country, faculty are creating opportunities to exchange ideas on teaching and, in the process, becoming more reflective about their teaching. In part, this is a response to national discussions about the false dichotomy that is often drawn between teaching and research. To move beyond this debate, there have been calls for expanding the idea of scholarship to include certain teaching products, as well as research products (Boyer, 1990). Three strategies for taking a scholarly approach to reviews of teaching are ones that are common to discussions of research as well (Shulman, 1993). First, scholarship is firmly grounded in the disciplines, and a scholarly approach to the review of teaching would focus on the teaching of a specific discipline. Second, just as research becomes scholarship when it is shared, faculty would need to begin making teaching community property. And finally, scholarship often involves making judgments about faculty work, which, for teaching, would mean that faculty would become more involved in reviewing each others' accomplishments in teaching and learning.

The teaching portfolio is one of the tools faculty can use to document their scholarly work in teaching. This Occasional Paper contains a discussion of the nature and purpose of the teaching portfolio (and its offshoot, the course portfolio) and suggestions for how individuals and units can use portfolios most effectively.

What Is a Teaching Portfolio?

A record of accomplishments in teaching

Based on the model of the portfolio kept by artists and architects, the teaching portfolio contains evidence of a faculty member's achievements in teaching: "What is a teaching portfolio? It includes documents and materials which collectively suggest the scope and quality of a professor's teaching performance. . . . The portfolio is not an exhaustive compilation of all of the documents and materials that bear on teaching performance. Instead, it presents *selected information* on teaching activities and *solid evidence* of their effectiveness" (Seldin, 1997, p. 2).

Documentation in context

The portfolio should be more than a simple collection of documents.

Matthew Kaplan is an instructional consultant in the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching.



CRLT Occasional Papers

—○—

The Center for Research
On Learning and Teaching

—○—

The University of Michigan

—○—

No. 11

It also should contain reflective statements on the material included and on the faculty member's approach to teaching and student learning. The reflective portions of the portfolio help set the documents in context for the reader; the materials provide evidence to back up the assertions made in the reflective statement.

What Might Go into a Portfolio?

When considering the contents of a portfolio, faculty must distinguish clearly between being *representative* and being *exhaustive*. Attempts to create an exhaustive compendium of an instructor's work in teaching run the risk of becoming exhausting, both for the person collecting the materials and for any readers who might choose (or need) to respond to the portfolio. Furthermore, the attempt to be completely comprehensive can turn the project of developing a portfolio into a paper chase. Such a large collection of documents makes it difficult to maintain the reflective aspect of the portfolio, which is one of its chief purposes and advantages.

The portfolio should, instead, be representative of the various aspects of a faculty member's teaching. This means looking beyond the most obvious part of teaching—what goes on in the classroom. While the activities and interactions with students in class are important, they do not fully reflect faculty work with teaching. Other items might include planning courses, assessing student learning, advising students (in office hours or in larger projects such as theses and dissertations), curriculum development and assessment, supervising student research, working to improve one's teaching, and publishing articles on teaching and learning.

One way to categorize items that a faculty member might include is to divide them into three categories based on the source of the item: materials from oneself (e.g., reflective statements, descriptions of course responsibilities, syllabi, assignments), materials from others (e.g., statements from colleagues who have observed or reviewed teaching materials, student ratings, letters from students or alumni, honors or recognition); and products of good teaching (student essays or creative work, a record of students who have succeeded in the field, evidence of supervision of theses). Some of these sources may be more appropriate for certain aspects of teaching than for others. See Appendix A for a more comprehensive list.

Purposes of Portfolios

Self-reflection and improvement

Assembling a portfolio involves reflection. Most portfolios include a reflective statement that can cover topics such as the instructor's approach to teaching and learning, his or her assumptions about the roles of students and teachers, and goals the instructor expects students to achieve (Chism, 1997-998). In addition, faculty need to collect documents that support their reflective statement, a process that also involves reflection (selecting some items over others, reviewing past work, etc.). As a result, the portfolio is well-suited to helping faculty examine their goals for teaching and student learning, and compare those goals to the reality of their praxis.

The comparison between the ideal and the real is the first step in the process of improving teaching. Instructors can gain a sense of how effective their teaching is and how they could improve from a variety of sources: student ratings of instruction, midsemester feedback, self-perception, discussions with colleagues, etc. By constructing a portfolio, faculty will look systematically at the various sources of data about their teaching; therefore, they can make more informed decisions about teaching strengths on which they wish to build and problems in their teaching they wish to address. The reflection and improvement process can be further enhanced when faculty work together (in pairs or small groups) as they develop their portfolios. Colleagues can offer support and advice, exchange new ideas and solutions to problems, and broaden each other's views of the teaching and learning process. Moreover, such exchanges help create a community of scholarship around teaching that is based on a concrete, discipline-specific context.

Decision making

Accomplishments in teaching are becoming a more important factor in administrative decisions such as tenure, promotion, reappointment, and merit increases. The teaching portfolio enables faculty and departments to insure that an instructor's work in teaching is judged using multiple forms of evaluation, seen by multiple eyes. This is important, since no one perspective can accurately represent faculty teaching. For instance, students can evaluate certain aspects of teaching that focus on classroom interactions, such as organization, rapport, and ability to stimulate discussion. On the other hand, faculty colleagues are in a position to judge items that are

beyond the expertise of students, such as how up-to-date material is, how well a course is integrated into the curriculum, etc.

Self-evaluation and reflection are also important, especially for providing a context for understanding data about teaching effectiveness. The portfolio as a whole gives individual faculty a sense of control over the evaluation process. In addition, departments that encourage faculty to submit portfolios will need to have discussions about what, if any, documents will be required and what will be left up to the individual faculty; how long the document can (or should) be; and how much reflection is required. Such discussions provide a useful venue for creating a shared sense of what constitutes good teaching in a department.

Graduate student portfolios

Graduate students who apply for faculty positions commonly use portfolios because many colleges and universities now require job applicants to provide some proof of teaching experience. Graduate students are turning to the portfolio as a way of organizing their work in this area. Currently, the requirements vary widely among schools. Some require just a list of courses taught or a reflective statement on teaching, and some ask for specific items (such as proposed syllabi for certain types of courses, student ratings, demonstrations of commitment to undergraduate research, etc.). The earlier in their teaching careers that graduate students begin to think about their portfolios, the more chance they will have to retrieve the documents they find most representative of their accomplishments. Aside from its value for the job market, the portfolio often represents the first time graduate students have had the opportunity to reflect on their teaching, which they often find both challenging and rewarding.

An Alternative to the Teaching Portfolio: Course Portfolios

A variation on the teaching portfolio is a course portfolio. As the name implies, these documents focus on a specific course, with a special emphasis on student learning. A course portfolio, therefore, is analogous to a scholarly project. It includes sections on goals (intended student learning outcomes), methods (teaching approaches used to achieve outcomes), and results (evidence of student learning) for a specific course.

Moreover, it is the relationship or congruence among these elements that makes for effectiveness. We expect a

research project to shed light on the questions and issues that shape it; we expect the methods used in carrying out the project to be congruent with the outcomes sought. And the same can be said of teaching.

By encompassing and connecting all three elements – planning, implementation, and results – the course portfolio has the distinctive advantage of representing the intellectual integrity of teaching. (Cerbin, 1993, p. 51)

Course portfolios offer advantages for the person developing them as well as for the curriculum. For the faculty member developing the portfolio, the advantages are similar to those of assembling a teaching portfolio (e.g., self-reflection and a chance to compare intentions with outcomes), but with more in-depth insight into the impact of teaching on students. For departments, course portfolios can provide continuity and reveal gaps in the curriculum. For example, a course portfolio becomes a record of the purpose and results of a course that can be passed on to the next person in charge of that course or to the faculty member who teaches the next course in a sequence. By examining a set of course portfolios, a curriculum committee can gain an overview of what students are learning and what is missing, which could help with the process of curriculum revision.

How are Portfolios Evaluated?

Just as there is no one model for a teaching portfolio, there is no one method for evaluation. Again, this is a strength of the portfolio, since it means that individual units will need to develop criteria for evaluation and make them relevant to faculty in that unit. The process of deciding on criteria can also help to clarify what faculty in that unit value with respect to teaching. For one example of an evaluation scheme, see Appendix B.

As units develop criteria for evaluating portfolios, they should first consider the ways they plan to use the portfolio. Will portfolios be limited to faculty being considered for tenure or promotion or for instructors nominated for teaching awards, or will all faculty prepare a course portfolio in preparation for a department-wide curriculum review? These purposes differ and so should the requirements for the portfolios involved.

Once the purpose is clear, faculty will probably want to create guidelines for assembling portfolios. While it is important to maintain the flexibility of the portfolio, it is also necessary to insure some degree of

consistency in order to make evaluation fairer and more reliable. Faculty might establish consensus on required items, such as a page limit for the overall size of the portfolio, the focus (a single course, an overview of teaching, or a combination), opportunities for reflection, or a template (so that faculty do not need to worry about format and can concentrate instead on the content). Ideally, such guidelines will be established with input from potential reviewers in the unit as well as those faculty who will be under review.

Advantages of Portfolios

In the AAHE monograph *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship of Teaching*, the authors describe four main benefits of the teaching portfolio (Edgerton, Hutchings, & Quinlan, 1991, pp. 4-6). Course portfolios have similar attributes.

1. *Capturing the complexity of teaching*

- Portfolios contain evidence and reflection in the context of what is being taught to whom under what conditions.
- The portfolio can present a view of a teacher's development over time.
- Entries in the portfolio can be annotated to explain their significance for the faculty member's teaching.

2. *Placing responsibility for evaluation in the hands of faculty*

- Faculty are actively involved in presenting their own teaching accomplishments so that evaluation is not something done "to" them.
- Portfolios extend evaluation beyond student ratings and encourage peer review and collaboration.
- The need to evaluate portfolios can lead to discussions on standards for effective teaching.

3. *Encouraging improvement and reflection*

- Assembling a portfolio involves reflection.
- Because they involve reflection, portfolios allow faculty to compare their ideals with their actions, a first step in efforts to improve.
- A faculty member's portfolio reveals both products (evidence) and processes (reflection) of teaching to colleagues who read it.

4. *Fostering a culture of teaching*

- Portfolios can provide a rich and contextualized source of evidence about teaching achievements

that can be used for a variety of purposes, including evaluation, improvement, summary of faculty careers, and defining "good teaching" in a department.

How Can Faculty Get Started?

Faculty can begin at any time to collect materials for their portfolios. At first, this process might entail simply saving relevant materials related to teaching so that they are readily accessible for review. At some point the faculty member will need to sort through the materials and decide which ones best represent his or her teaching accomplishments. Often this process is enhanced when faculty collaborate with each other as they build their portfolios.

CRLT offers campus-wide workshops on teaching and course portfolios, and we can bring a customized workshop to departments. The focus of the workshop is to help faculty develop a clear idea of what a portfolio is and what items it might include and to give faculty an opportunity to begin a reflective statement on teaching. When workshops are conducted in a department, faculty can begin to answer the question, "What is good teaching in our department?" CRLT also provides one-on-one consultations for individual faculty who are working on their portfolios and for units as they develop a systematic approach to portfolios.

References

- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Cerbin, W. (1993). Inventing a new genre: The course portfolio at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. In P. Hutchings (Ed.), *Making teaching community property: A menu for peer collaboration and peer review* (pp. 49-56). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Chism, N. V. (1997-1998). Developing a philosophy of teaching statement. *Essays on Teaching Excellence: Toward the Best in the Academy*, 9(3).
- Edgerton, R., Hutchings, P., & Quinlan, K. (1991). *The teaching portfolio: Capturing the scholarship of teaching*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Shulman, L. (1993, November/December). Teaching as community property: Putting an end to pedagogical solitude. *Change*, 6-7.

Seldin, P. (1997). *The teaching portfolio* (2nd ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Shore, B., Foster, S., Knapper, c., Nadeau, G., Neill, N., & Sini, V. (1986). *The teaching dossier: A guide to its preparation and use*. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Association of University Teachers.

Possible items for inclusion

Faculty members should recognize which of the items which might be included in a teaching dossier would most effectively give a favorable impression of teaching competence and which might better be used for self-evaluation and improvement. The dossier should be compiled to make the best possible case for teaching effectiveness.

THE PRODUCTS OF GOOD TEACHING

1. Students' scores on teacher-made or standardized tests, possibly before and after a course has been taken as evidence of learning.
2. Student laboratory workbooks and other kinds of workbooks or logs.
3. Student essays, creative work, and project or field-work reports.
4. Publications by students on course-related work.
5. A record of students who select and succeed in advanced courses of study in the field.
6. A record of students who elect another course with the same professor.
7. Evidence of effective supervision of Honors, Master's or Ph.D. theses.
8. Setting up or running a successful internship program.
9. Documentary evidence of the effect of courses on student career choice.
10. Documentary evidence of help given by the professor to students in securing employment.
11. Evidence of help given to colleagues on teaching improvement.

MATERIAL FROM ONESELF

Descriptive material on current and recent teaching responsibilities and practices.

12. List of course titles and numbers, unit values or credits, enrollments with brief elaboration.
13. List of course materials prepared for students.
14. Information on professor's availability to students.
15. Report on identification of student difficulties and encouragement of student participation in courses or programs.
16. Description of how films, computers or other nonprint materials were used in teaching.
17. Steps taken to emphasize the interrelatedness and relevance of different kinds of learning.

Description of steps taken to evaluate and improve one's teaching.

18. Maintaining a record of the changes resulting from self-evaluation.
19. Reading journals on improving teaching and attempting to implement acquired ideas.
20. Reviewing new teaching materials for possible application.
21. Exchanging course materials with a colleague from another institution.
22. Conducting research on one's own teaching or course.
23. Becoming involved in an association or society concerned with the improvement of teaching and learning.
24. Attempting instructional innovations and evaluating their effectiveness.

25. Using general support services such as the Education Resources Information Centre (ERIC) in improving one's teaching.
26. Participating in seminars, workshops and professional meetings intended to improve teaching.
27. Participating in course or curriculum development.
28. Pursuing a line of research that contributes directly to teaching.
29. Preparing a textbook or other instructional materials.
30. Editing or contributing to a professional journal on teaching one's subject.

INFORMATION FROM OTHERS

Students:

31. Student course and teaching evaluation data which suggest improvements or produce an overall rating of effectiveness or satisfaction.
32. Written comments from a student committee to evaluate courses and provide feedback.
33. Unstructured (and possibly unsolicited) written evaluations by students, including written comments on exams and letters received after a course has been completed.
34. Documented reports of satisfaction with out-of-class contacts.
35. Interview data collected from students after completion of a course.
36. Honors received from students, such as being elected "teacher of the year".

Colleagues:

37. Statements from colleagues who have observed teaching either as members of a teaching team or as independent observers of a particular course, or who teach other sections of the same course.
38. Written comments from those who teach courses for which a particular course is a prerequisite.
39. Evaluation of contributions to course development and improvement.
40. Statements from colleagues from other institutions on such matters as how well students have been prepared for graduate studies.
41. Honors or recognition such as a distinguished teacher award or election to a committee on teaching.
42. Requests for advice or acknowledgement of advice received by a committee on teaching or similar body.

Other sources:

43. Statements about teaching achievements from administrators at one's own institution or from other institutions.
44. Alumni ratings or other graduate feedback.
45. Comments from parents of students.
46. Reports from employers of students (e.g., in a work-study or "cooperative" program).
47. Invitations to teach for outside agencies.
48. Invitations to contribute to the teaching literature.
49. Other kinds of invitations based on one's reputation as a teacher (for example, a media interview on a successful teaching innovation).

Appendix A

Note: From *The Teaching Dossier: A Guide to Its Preparation and Use* (pp. 14-23) by B. Shore, S. Foster, C. Knapper, G. Nadeau, N. Neill, and V. Sim, 1986, Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Association of University Teachers. Reprinted by permission.

SUGGESTED FORM FOR PEER REVIEW OF UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING BASED ON DOSSIER MATERIALS

QUESTION	DOSSIER MATERIALS	SUGGESTED FOCUS IN EXAMINING DOSSIER MATERIALS
1. What is the quality of materials used in teaching?	Course outline Syllabus Reading list Text used Study guide Description of non-print materials Hand-outs Problem sets Assignments	Are these materials current? Do they represent the best work in the field? Are they adequate and appropriate to course goals? Do they represent superficial or thorough coverage of course content?
Peer Reviewer's Rating: Low ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Very High		
Comments: _____		

2. What kind of intellectual tasks were set by the teacher for the students (or did the teacher succeed in getting students to set for themselves). And how did the students perform?	Copies of graded examinations Examples of graded research papers Examples of teacher's feedback to students on written work Grade distribution Descriptions of student performances, e.g., class presentation, etc. Examples of completed assignments	What was the level of intellectual performance achieved by the students? What kind of work was given an A? a B? a C? Did the students learn what the department curriculum expected for this course? How adequately do the tests or assignments represent the kinds of student performance specified in the course objectives?
Peer Reviewer's Rating: Low ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Very High		
Comments: _____		

3. How knowledgeable is this faculty member in subjects taught?	Evidence in teaching materials Record of attendance at regional or national meetings Record of colloquia or lectures given	Has the instructor kept in thoughtful contact with developments in his or her field? Is there evidence of acquaintance with the ideas and findings of other scholars? (This question addresses the scholarship necessary to good teaching. It is not concerned with scholarly research publication.)
Peer Reviewer's Rating: Low ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Very High		
Comments: _____		

4. Has this faculty member assumed responsibilities related to the department's or University's teaching mission?	Record of service on department curriculum committee, honors program, advising board of teaching support service, special committees (e.g., to examine grading policies, admission standards, etc.) Description of activities in supervising graduate students learning to teach. Evidence of design of new courses.	Has he or she become a departmental or college citizen in regard to teaching responsibilities? Does this faculty member recognize problems that hinder good teaching and does he or she take a responsible part in trying to solve them? Is the involvement of the faculty member appropriate to his or her academic level? (e.g., assistant professors may sometimes become over-involved to the detriment of their scholarly and teaching activities.)
Peer Reviewer's Rating: Low ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Very High		
Comments: _____		

5. To what extent is this faculty member trying to achieve excellence in teaching?	Factual statement of what activities the faculty member has engaged in to improve his or her teaching. Examples of questionnaires used for formative purposes. Examples of changes made on the basis of feedback.	Has he or she sought feedback about teaching quality, explored alternative teaching methods, made changes to increase student learning? Has he or she sought aid in trying new teaching ideas? Has he or she developed special teaching materials or participated in cooperative efforts aimed at upgrading teaching quality?
Peer Reviewer's Rating: Low ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Very High		
Comments: _____		

GF LAZOVIK 1979
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Peer Reviewer's Signature _____

Date _____

Reprinted by permission.

The *CRLT Occasional Papers* series is published on a variable schedule by the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching at the University of Michigan. Information about extra copies or back issues can be obtained by writing to Publications, CRLT, 3300 School of Education Building, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259. This issue was edited by Lisa A. Mets.

Copyright 1998 The University of Michigan

CRLT Occasional Paper No. 11

The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching

The University of Michigan
3300 School of Education Bldg.
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259

SOLICITATION LETTER TEMPLATE

At a minimum, the following language is required:

[Date]

[Name]

[Title]

[Department]

[Institution]

[Street Address]

[City, State, Zip]

Dear Professor [Name]:

The [Unit(s)] at the University of Michigan [is/are] considering [Candidate Name] for promotion from the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure] to the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure]. Faculty at the University of Michigan are promoted on the basis of research, scholarly, and creative contributions; teaching ability; and service. Recognition of the quality of their work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process. We value your candid assessment of [Candidate Name's] research accomplishments and future promise, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Your scholarly and professional judgments will play an important part in our evaluation of [Candidate Name] for promotion.

[ONLY FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY SEEKING TENURE]: Please keep in mind that at the University of Michigan the criteria for the granting of tenure are the same regardless of the length of a candidate's service as an untenured faculty member. [[ADD THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE IF THE SCHOOL/COLLEGE ONLY ALLOWS ONE ATTEMPT AT TENURE: "Also note that, except in rare circumstances, a review for tenure in [Unit] can only occur once."]] We ask that you be attentive to our policies in your evaluation of [Candidate Name].]

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

1. How do you know [Candidate Name]? (in what capacity and for how long?)
2. What are your impressions about the quality, quantity, focus and scholarly impact of [Candidate Name's] works?
3. Which, if any, of the scholarly publications or works do you consider to be outstanding?
4. How would you estimate [Candidate Name's] standing in relation to others in [his/her] peer group who are working in the same field?

5. How would you evaluate [Candidate Name's] service contributions to the discipline; that is, [his/her] work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?
6. Might [his/her] work meet the requirements for someone being considered for promotion and, if applicable, tenure at your institution?

[The following paragraph (word-for-word) must be included in ALL letters soliciting an evaluation of the candidate.]

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

We request that you return your review to us by [Date]. We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise and current research interests.

We realize that your schedule is full and that this may be a time-consuming task; however, we will be most grateful for your assistance. We have selected you because of your expertise in this area. Should you fail to respond, this will be so noted in the promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Title]

Enclosures

SOLICITATION LETTER TEMPLATE

At a minimum, the following language is required:

[Date]

[Name]

[Title]

[Department]

[Institution]

[Street Address]

[City, State, Zip]

Dear Professor [Name]:

The [Unit(s)] at the University of Michigan [is/are] considering [Candidate Name] for promotion from the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure] to the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure]. Faculty at the University of Michigan are promoted on the basis of research, scholarly, and creative contributions; teaching ability; and service. Recognition of the quality of their work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process. We value your candid assessment of [Candidate Name's] research accomplishments and future promise, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Your scholarly and professional judgments will play an important part in our evaluation of [Candidate Name] for promotion.

[ONLY FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY SEEKING TENURE]: Please keep in mind that at the University of Michigan the criteria for the granting of tenure are the same regardless of the length of a candidate's service as an untenured faculty member. [[ADD THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE IF THE SCHOOL/COLLEGE ONLY ALLOWS ONE ATTEMPT AT TENURE: "Also note that, except in rare circumstances, a review for tenure in [Unit] can only occur once."]] We ask that you be attentive to our policies in your evaluation of [Candidate Name].]

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

REMINDER

[Candidate Name] is engaged in research that is interdisciplinary in nature. [He/she holds a joint appointment in the departments of [discipline] and [discipline].] We invite your consideration of the interdisciplinary nature of [Candidate Name's] work in your review of [his/her] scholarly contributions.

We would appreciate your comments on the following issues:

1. How do you know [Candidate Name]? (in what capacity and for how long?)

2. What are your impressions about the quality, quantity, focus and scholarly impact of the [Candidate Name's] works?
3. Which, if any, of the scholarly publications or works do you consider to be outstanding?
4. How would you estimate [Candidate Name's] standing in relation to others in [his/her] peer group who are working in the same field?
5. How would you evaluate [Candidate Name's] service contributions to the discipline; that is, <his/her> work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?
6. Might [his/her] work meet the requirements for someone being considered for promotion and, if applicable, tenure at your institution?

[The following paragraph (word-for-word) must be included in ALL letters soliciting an evaluation of the candidate.]

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

We request that you return your review to us by [Date]. We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise and current research interests.

We realize that your schedule is full and that this may be a time-consuming task; however, we will be most grateful for your assistance. We have selected you because of your expertise in this area. Should you fail to respond, this will be so noted in the promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Title]

Enclosures

SOLICITATION LETTER TEMPLATE

At a minimum, the following language is required:

[Date]

[Name]

[Title]

[Department]

[Institution]

[Street Address]

[City, State, Zip]

Dear Professor [Name]:

The [Unit] at the University of Michigan is considering [Candidate Name] for promotion from the rank of Clinical [specify rank] to the rank of Clinical [specify rank] on the clinical instructional track. Faculty at the University of Michigan on the clinical instructional track are promoted on the basis of [any specific responsibilities for clinical instructional track faculty in your specific unit]; contributions to scholarly productivity; teaching ability; and service. Recognition of the quality of their work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process. We value your candid assessment of [Candidate Name's] contributions and future promise, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Your professional judgments will play an important part in our evaluation of [Candidate Name] for promotion.

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

1. How do you know [Candidate Name]? (in what capacity and for how long?)
2. What are your impressions of [Candidate Name's] scholarly and professional work?
3. How would you estimate [Candidate Name's] standing in relation to others in [his/her] peer group who are working in the same field?
4. How would you evaluate [Candidate Name's] service contributions to the discipline; that is, [his/her] work on regional and/or national professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?
5. Does your institution have a track and rank equivalent to the track and rank in which [Candidate Name] is being considered for promotion? If so, would [Candidate Name] be likely to achieve the equivalent rank at your institution?

[The following paragraph (word-for-word) must be included in ALL letters soliciting an evaluation of the candidate.]

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

We request that you return your review to us by [Date]. We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise.

We realize that your schedule is full and that this may be a time-consuming task; however, we will be most grateful for your assistance. We have selected you because of your expertise in this area. Should you fail to respond, this will be so noted in the promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name]
[Title]

Enclosures

SOLICITATION LETTER TEMPLATE

At a minimum, the following language is required:

[Date]

[Name]

[Title]

[Department]

[Institution]

[Street Address]

[City, State, Zip]

Dear Professor [Name]:

The [Unit] at the University of Michigan is considering [Candidate Name] for promotion from the rank of Research [specify rank] to the rank of Research [specify rank] on the research professor track. Faculty at the University of Michigan on the research professor track are promoted on the basis of research, scholarly, and creative contributions; mentoring; and service. Recognition of the quality of their work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process. We value your candid assessment of [Candidate Name's] research accomplishments and future promise, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Your scholarly and professional judgments will play an important part in our evaluation of [Candidate Name] for promotion.

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

1. How do you know [Candidate Name]? (in what capacity and for how long?)
2. What are your impressions about the quality, quantity, focus and scholarly impact of [Candidate Name's] works?
3. Which, if any, of the scholarly publications or works do you consider to be outstanding?
4. How would you estimate [Candidate Name's] standing in relation to others in [his/her] peer group who are working in the same field?
5. How would you evaluate [Candidate Name's] service contributions to the discipline; that is, [his/her] work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an editor, or similar activities?
6. Might [his/her] work meet the requirements for someone being considered for promotion at your institution?

[The following paragraph (word-for-word) must be included in ALL letters soliciting an evaluation of the candidate.]

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

We request that you return your review to us by [Date]. We would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch, including a brief description of your areas of expertise and current research interests.

We realize that your schedule is full and that this may be a time-consuming task; however, we will be most grateful for your assistance. We have selected you because of your expertise in this area. Should you fail to respond, this will be so noted in the promotion record. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Title]

Enclosures

Attachment G

A. ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF “ARM’S LENGTH” EXTERNAL REVIEWERS WHO PROVIDED LETTERS

Padme Amidala (Reviewer A.) Associate Professor of History and Women's Studies and Affiliate in Galactic Studies at University of Naboo. Professor Amidala is one of the most compelling historians exploring space, particularly in relation to Naboo history. Among her many articles is “Mapping the landscape and suns of Tatooine” in the *Journal of Galactic History*. **(arm’s length – suggested by the department)**

Poe Dameron (Reviewer B.) Director of the Galactic History Project and Professor of the Humanities at Saturn University. Professor Dameron is the resident historian of the Galactic Institute National Historic Site. As the Director of the Saturn History Project, he is at the helm of the most comprehensive project documenting history in our universe. He is a former president of The Force Awakens Project at Mechanical State University, Saturn’s land-grant school under the Habitat Act. **(arm’s length – suggested by the department)**

Qui-Gon Jinn (Reviewer C.) Professor of Landscape Architecture at the University of Galactic Republic and Fellow of the Republic Society of Landscape Architecture. Professor Jinn is co-editor of *Landscape and Space*, 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. **(arm’s length – suggested by the department)**

Hans Solo (Reviewer D.) Professor Emeritus of Landscape Architecture at Corellia University and is the leader of the Rebel Alliance and was named a Fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architects. He headed a team that authored the report that led to the Corellia campus designation as a national historic site. **(arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)**

Jedi Yoda (Reviewer E.) Professor Emeritus of Architecture, Dagobah Institute of Technology. Professor Yoda has been one of the pioneers of criticism in architecture. He co-founded the Neptune School of Planning and Architecture. Among his many publications is his book, *An assessment of the environmentally friendly*. **(arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)**

B. ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF “NON-ARM’S LENGTH” EXTERNAL REVIEWERS WHO PROVIDED LETTERS

Mon Mothma (Reviewer F.) Associate Professor of Urban Design and Planning, College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning at the University of Mars. Professor Mothma is one of the most vigorous scholars at the cutting edge of architectural discourse. The author of the highly praised *Post-modern Municipals* (published by BlackInk Press and reissued by Prince Harry Architectural Press) has helped to bridge the gap between architectural discourse and contemporary cultural criticism. **Professor Mothma is co-author on several articles with the candidate. (non-arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)**

Bail Organa (Reviewer G.) Professor of Landscape Architecture and former Dean of the School of Environmental Design at the University of Milky Way. Professor Organa was a founding editor of *Landscaper’s Royal Journal*, the foremost journal in the field. He is a Fellow of the Galactic Senate Society of Landscape Architects. **Professor Organa was the candidate’s mentor. (non-arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)**

C. ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF EXTERNAL REVIEWERS FROM WHOM LETTERS WERE REQUESTED BUT WHO DECLINED AND THE REASONS FOR DECLINING

Lando Calrissian (Reviewer H.) Professor Calrissian declined because of his limited knowledge of the candidate’s work. He is Professor of Law at Chewbacca 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 2017 from the Republic Publishers Association. **(arm’s length – suggested by the department)**

Obi-Wan Kenobi, Jr. (Reviewer I.) Professor Kenobi declined because of a lack of time due to a family emergency. He is the Jedi Professor of Law at Yavin University, where he teaches property and legal history. He was previously a member of the University of Stewjon 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. **(arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)**

Leia Organa (Reviewer J.) Professor Organa declined because she is out of the country. She is the Ewok Professor of Law and Organization at Tatooine Law School, where she teaches property, contracts, environmental law, land use planning, and natural resources law. She was previously on the faculties of Hoth Law School, University of Bespin, Northern Lights University, and University of Corellia. She is co-author of a casebook on property law and is a leading scholar on property theory. **(arm’s length – suggested by the department)**

Luke Skywalker (Reviewer K.) Professor Skywalker did not respond to numerous email requests. He is the Jar Jar Binks Professor Emeritus of Law at Alderaan University where he taught courses in jurisprudence and legal theory. He was previously a member of faculty of the University of Endor, School of Law. He is the author of a book on the theory of private property. **Professor Skywalker was the candidate’s thesis advisor. (non-arm’s length – suggested by the candidate)**

RESEARCH FACULTY**Statement of Understanding
Regarding Responsibility for Bridging Support**

[submit this form with the dossier recommending a research faculty candidate for promotion]

This “Statement of Understanding” is being submitted in support of the appointment/promotion of:

 Printed Name

 Employee ID Number
Responsibility for Bridging Support

The University of Michigan Office of Research (UMOR) may provide [after appropriate review] up to 50% of the minimal bridging support according to the accompanying table (on back of this page); the remaining 50% is the responsibility of the appointing unit. Unit heads are expected to build reserves appropriate to cover their responsibility for bridging support. In addition, units are encouraged to provide additional bridging support (including salary support for longer time periods, and research support). UMOR cannot guarantee central participation in this additional support, but individual members of the research faculty are eligible to apply for funding through the UMOR Faculty Grants and Award Program on the usual competitive basis.

Statement of Understanding

As the dean/director of the unit recommending the individual for promotion, I understand my unit’s responsibility for bridging support and will take steps to meet the 50% minimum obligation within the specified five-year time frame. Additional support, up to 50%, may be applied for from UMOR.

 Signature

 Printed Name

 Date

 Unit

Bridging Support for Research Faculty

The table below outlines the level of bridging support eligibility according to rank and years of service at the University of Michigan. A minimum commitment of a dollar-for-dollar match is expected from the research faculty member's home unit as part of all requests to the University of Michigan Office of Research for bridging support.

Rank/Years of Service	Funding Eligibility (Salary and fringes in any five-year period)
Research Investigator	Not eligible
Assistant, Associate, & Research Scientist and Research Assistant Professor Less than 3 years of service	Not eligible
Assistant, Associate, & Research Scientist and Research Assistant Professor 3-5 years of service	Up to 2 months
Assistant, Associate, Research Scientist, and Research Assistant Professor 5-10 years of service	Up to 3 months
Assistant, Associate and Research Scientist and Research Assistant Professor 10+ years of service	Up to 6 months
Research Associate Professor and Research Professor Less than 3 years of service	Up to 6 months
Research Associate Professor and Research Professor 3 or more years of total service, including all years in RS Track above the rank of Research Investigator and all years in Research Professor Track	Up to 12 months