

DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY

JUNIOR FACULTY CAREER ADVISING AND REVIEWS

Constructive advising and reviewing of tenure-track faculty help faculty meet high standards of rigor, depth and innovation in scholarship and to realize their full potential as scholars, teachers and members of the academic community. The College has established a set of principles and best practices involved in mentoring and reviewing tenure-track junior (i.e., untenured) faculty. The Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB) has used these to develop the specific procedures described below that will be followed in our department. For faculty with joint appointments with other units, the specific mentoring and annual/third-year review procedures for each case will be specified in a joint letter to the new faculty member from the Chairs or Directors of all units involved.

Because it is important that junior faculty feel comfortable discussing a wide range of concerns with their mentors, and because a mentor should play a role as advocate for their mentee, we discuss separate processes for ensuring career advice and mentoring for junior faculty and for evaluation of junior faculty. Separate faculty members will be involved in these two critical functions as much as possible, recognizing that some constraints are present given the range of expertise present in the department. The Chair will normally be involved in both processes.

CAREER ADVICE AND MENTORING

First year: Prior to the arrival of the faculty member in the Department, the Chair will discuss with the new junior faculty member appropriate senior faculty to assign as mentors. Early in the first term of the junior faculty member's first year, he or she will meet with the Chair and receive a copy of the College and Departmental policies and procedures for career advising, third-year reviews, and tenure review, including the handbook on *Giving and Getting Career Advice: A Guide for Junior and Senior Faculty*. If not already decided prior to the arrival of the faculty member, final decisions on two faculty mentors will be made during that meeting; mentors will normally be of professorial rank, although associate professors may serve in this role if deemed appropriate by the Chair. The meeting will include a thorough explanation of the schedule and procedures of both the career advising and the review processes. The conversation will include an explicit reminder that neither a renewal of the contract after three years nor an eventual granting of tenure is guaranteed.

It is the responsibility of the Chair to ensure that both mentors agree to serve in this role. It is up to the new faculty member and mentors to define the format and approaches for meeting, but the relationship should involve ongoing discussions of the expectations for research, teaching, and service to the Department, the University, and the larger academic community—the handbook mentioned above is an excellent source of useful topics for discussion. To facilitate mentoring relationships, the Department will provide funds for

one lunch meeting a semester for the junior faculty member with his/her mentor(s). More frequent meetings and informal relationships are encouraged.

Each year: The Chair will ensure a continuing relationship between the junior faculty member and his/her mentors, including monitoring that meetings occur at least once a semester and assigning additional mentors if desired by the junior faculty member. The Chair will also meet with each junior faculty member each winter term (see evaluation procedures below) and will meet with the junior faculty as a group at least once per year. Junior faculty will also be encouraged to host senior researchers in their field as departmental seminar speakers for more research-specific mentoring and will be given first priority for inviting seminar speakers each year. Funds for this purpose will be allocated from those available for career advising from the College.

Peer mentoring: The Chair will facilitate peer mentoring among the junior faculty, including: 1) provision of funds for a monthly meeting (e.g., over lunch) of all junior faculty to discuss issues of mutual concern and interest, and 2) facilitation of the participation of any guests, both internal and external to the department, whom the junior faculty choose to invite to help address those issues.

Teaching mentoring: The first time a junior faculty member teaches their larger-enrollment class, each of his/her assigned mentors will visit the class at least once (using the Tables in the protocol in Appendix I if desired) and discuss their conclusions with the faculty member on an informal basis. The results will NOT be reported to the PMC or department chair, nor will they be placed in the personnel file.

College support for career advising: The College of LSA allocates up to a total of \$3500 to each department at the time of appointment of a new assistant professor. These funds are to be used for Career Advising/Mentoring activities over the course of the Assistant Professor's time at this rank (Appendix III). EEB uses \$1500 of these funds towards formal mentoring meetings and bringing in senior faculty invited by the assistant professor for research mentoring and networking, along with giving a departmental seminar. The remaining funds can be requested by the assistant professor for specific mentoring activities, using the form in Appendix IV.

EVALUATION

Each year: During the winter semester of each year, each junior faculty member will meet with the Promotion and Merit Committee of the Department. The meeting will review teaching, research, and service in relation to progress towards tenure, and, as appropriate, curatorial contributions. The meeting should address areas of strength and areas for improvement in teaching, research and service, and (as appropriate) curatorial activities. The meetings should offer advice and encouragement to the candidate and should seek constructive ways of addressing any emerging problems. The meeting should also review the level of teaching and service efforts to ensure that the junior faculty member is not being unduly burdened. The PMC will then send a brief summary of the discussion to the

Chair, with a copy to the junior faculty member's mentors. This summary should include concrete recommendations for future actions by the junior faculty and the department. The Chair will invite a response from the mentors and, as appropriate, Director of the museum unit in which the faculty member has curatorial duties, including whether they recommend any additional actions by the department to help further develop the career of the junior faculty member.

After receiving the PMC report and comments by the mentors, the Chair will meet with the junior faculty member to discuss his/her areas of strengths and areas for improvement, along with the concrete recommendations from the PMC. The discussion should then be summarized by the Chair in a letter to the junior faculty member. The junior faculty member will respond to this letter confirming, or, if necessary clarifying the accuracy of its summary. A copy of the final letter summarizing the discussions, agreed to by both the junior faculty member and the Chair should be sent to the departmental-assigned mentors of the junior faculty member, as well as placed in his/her personnel file.

Third year: At the beginning of the fall semester of the junior faculty member's third year, the Chair will identify the semester in which his or her larger-enrollment class is taught and ask the Curriculum Committee to arrange a classroom visit review, to be reported to the PMC. The classroom visit review will follow standard protocols for the department (see Appendix I). Near the end of that semester, the chair of the Promotions and Merit Committee will send the junior faculty member a letter requesting the following information, with deadlines:

1. Lists of University of Michigan colleagues and current and former students who can be asked to comment on the junior faculty member's performance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and/or service as appropriate. In the case of those with curatorial appointments, names should also be provided of individuals who can comment on the area of curatorial performance. The Chair may add names to this list, in consultation with the Promotions and Merit Committee. Candidates should indicate to the Chair the names of persons they consider inappropriate to assess their work by reason of conflict of interest, or kinship or domestic relationship, and should indicate why they consider these persons inappropriate. In such cases, the Chair should not ask these persons to provide internal assessments.
2. A copy of the current year's annual faculty report, a current curriculum vitae with a complete list of publications, research statement, teaching statement, course syllabi, other evidence of teaching performance during the junior faculty member's time at the University of Michigan, curatorial statement if appropriate, and copies of the most significant publications, including manuscripts under review if desired.
3. A schedule for the Promotions and Merit Committee to meet with the junior faculty member during the first part of winter term.

The current file including the letters provided by the colleagues and students and the classroom visit review from the Curriculum Committee will be read by all members of the Promotions and Merit Committee before meeting with the junior faculty member. For

junior faculty with a curatorial appointment, if the Promotions and Merit Committee does not include a member with a curatorial appointment, , an *ad hoc* member with such an appointment will be appointed by the Chair as an additional member of the Promotions and Merit Committee, for the purposes of review of that faculty member only.

The meeting will discuss all aspects of the junior faculty member's progress to date. This will include explicit comments on both strengths and weaknesses of the record, and the expectations of the Department with respect to improvements of the record. The committee should determine that the candidate is not being unduly burdened by excessive new course preparations, large classes, or excess service assignments, and that the candidate has the opportunity to teach at the senior undergraduate and graduate level in the candidate's area of research. The junior faculty member will receive a description of the procedure for evaluation for tenure and promotion.

By mid-March of the winter term, the Promotions and Merit Committee will submit to the Chair a summary of their review and recommendations. That report will be a clear, accurate and constructive commentary and, in addition to a review of progress to-date, will include:

1. A recommendation concerning whether the junior faculty member's contract should be renewed for a second three-year period.
2. In the case of a positive recommendation, specific suggestions for changes both by the junior faculty member and by the Department that might improve the junior faculty member's prospects to gain tenure.
3. In the case of a negative recommendation, specific reasons for the Committee's conclusion that the junior faculty member is unlikely to meet the standards for promotion with tenure and any other bases for its recommendation that the junior faculty member's contract not be renewed.

The Chair will appoint a nine member Third-Year Review Committee to discuss and vote whether to accept the PMC's recommendation. The Committee will consist of the tenured members of the Executive Committee, the members of the Promotion and Merit Committee, and additional tenured faculty as needed to make up a group of nine members. For faculty with curatorial appointments, at least two of the members of the Third-Year Review Committee should also have curatorial appointments, preferably in the same museum unit as the junior faculty member. The Chair will serve as *ex officio* chair of the Committee.

If the vote of the Third-Year Review Committee is for non-renewal, the complete dossier and PMC report will be forwarded to the LSA Divisional Associate Dean for review by the LSA Executive Committee. If the LSA Executive Committee concludes that the department has conducted a thorough review and has valid reasons for non-renewal, the Department Chair will then notify the junior faculty member. The timing of this notification is subject to LSA's schedule but the department will do its best to ensure that notification of non-renewal can be given by the end of March. The junior faculty member would then be

offered a contract for a terminal year. The LSA Faculty Code requires that notice of intention not to reappoint be given to the faculty member in writing no later than September 15 of that final year of appointment.

If the vote of the Third-Year Review Committee is for renewal, by the end of March of the winter term of the 3rd year, the Chair will meet with the junior faculty member. In that meeting, the Chair will give the junior faculty member a copy of the recommendation and will tell the junior faculty member of the decision of the Third-Year Review Committee. The discussion will include the Department's expectations over the next three years. The junior faculty member and the Chair will initial the appropriate items and fill out the mentoring and professional development plans in the Third Year Review Summary Report form (Appendix II)

After that meeting with the Chair, copies of the Summary Report will be distributed to the junior faculty member, his or her mentors, the Department personnel file, and the LSA Dean's Office.

<i>Approved by the EEB Executive Committee:</i>	<i>May 16, 2005</i>
<i>Revisions approved by EEB Faculty:</i>	<i>April 21, 2008</i>
<i>Revisions approved by EEB Executive Committee:</i>	<i>October 26, 2009</i>
<i>Revisions approved by EEB Faculty:</i>	<i>November 23, 2009</i>
<i>Revisions approved by EEB Executive Committee:</i>	<i>March 7, 2011</i>
<i>Revisions approved by EEB Faculty:</i>	<i>March 28, 2011</i>
<i>Revisions approved by EEB Faculty:</i>	<i>January 19, 2015</i>

APPENDIX I
ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
PEER REVIEW PROTOCOL FOR UNDERGRADUATE CLASSROOM TEACHING

1. Faculty to be reviewed are identified by the Chair at the beginning of the term in which peer review is to be carried out. The first time a large-enrollment course is taught, the faculty mentors of the instructor will carry out the review, and no report will be forwarded beyond that to the instructor. For third year and tenure reviews, two faculty committee members from the Curriculum Committee are assigned to each faculty member to be reviewed.
2. The two raters meet with the instructor to arrange two dates on which classes will be observed, discuss the instructor's plans for those classes, request course materials to be reviewed, and go over the two rating forms with the instructor.
3. The raters observe the first class and independently fill out class observation rating forms (Table 1). Soon afterward (within a week) they meet to reconcile their ratings of each of the ten items on the form and enter the reconciled ratings on a consensus form. If the raters cannot agree on how to rate an item, an average of their individual ratings is entered. The same procedure is subsequently used for the second class observation.
4. After the classroom visits, the raters independently fill out course material rating forms (Table 2) and reconcile them to arrive at a consensus rating.
5. The Curriculum Committee members or the mentors draft a letter that summarizes and discusses the instructor's strengths and areas that need improvement. The draft is delivered to the instructor with an invitation to meet with the evaluators to discuss the findings. For third-year and tenure review, the evaluators may then choose to modify the draft letter, in light of this discussion with the instructor.
6. For third-year reviews, the final letter is then sent to the Promotion and Merit Committee, with a copy to the mentors. For tenure reviews, the final letter is then sent to the Tenure Panel.
7. All reviewed instructors are encouraged to meet with the curriculum committee to discuss the evaluations and to formulate measures they might take to improve their teaching.

Approved by the Curriculum Committee: October 23, 2009

Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
PEER REVIEW TABLE 1
Class Observation Checklist

Course Number _____ Course Name _____

Instructor: _____ Date of Observation _____

Rough Estimate of Class Size on Date of Observation _____

Circle your responses to each of the ten questions, then add comments below the table.

	Extremely	Very Well	Adequately	Inadequately	Not at all	No basis for assessment
The instructor						
1-was well prepared for class	5	4	3	2	1	
2-was knowledgeable about the subject matter	5	4	3	2	1	
3- was enthusiastic about the subject matter	5	4	3	2	1	
4-spoke clearly, audibly, and confidently	5	4	3	2	1	
5-made effective use of relevant illustrations/ examples/ visual aids	5	4	3	2	1	
6-asked stimulating and challenging questions, achieving active student involvement	5	4	3	2	1	
7-effectively held the class's attention	5	4	3	2	1	
8- treated students impartially and with respect	5	4	3	2	1	
9-left sufficient time for questions both within the lecture and afterwards	5	4	3	2	1	
10- shows awareness of students' reactions to course material and is aware when students struggle with topics						

Overall rating: add the circled responses and divide by 10: _____ (note divide by appropriate number if there was no basis for some answers)

What worked well in the class? (continue on back as needed)

What could have been improved? (continue on back as needed)

Rater(s) _____

Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
PEER REVIEW TABLE 2
Course Material Checklist

Course Number _____ Course Name _____

Instructor: _____ Date of Evaluation _____

Circle your responses to each of the ten questions, then add comments below the table.

	Extremely	Very Well	Adequately	Inadequately	Not at all	No basis for assessment
The instructor						
Course content includes the appropriate topics	5	4	3	2	1	
Course content reflects the current state of the field	5	4	3	2	1	
Course learning objectives are clear and appropriate	5	4	3	2	1	
Course policies and rules are clear and appropriate	5	4	3	2	1	
Lecture notes are well organized and clearly written	5	4	3	2	1	
Supplementary handouts and web pages are well organized and clearly written	5	4	3	2	1	
Assignments are consistent with objectives and appropriately challenging	5	4	3	2	1	
Tests are consistent with learning objectives and appropriately challenging, clearly written and reasonable in length	5	4	3	2	1	
Student work demonstrates fulfilling the learning objectives	5	4	3	2	1	
Use of CTOOLS is appropriate and adequate	5	4	3	2	1	

Overall rating: add the circled responses and divide by 10: _____ (note: divide by appropriate number if there was no basis for some answers)

What are the strengths of the course materials? (continue on back as needed)

What could have been improved? (continue on back as needed)

Rater(s) _____

Appendix II

Third-Year Review Summary Report & Recommendation for Renewal College of Literature, Science, and the Arts

Faculty Member Name: _____ Department/Program: _____

(for joint appointees) Department/Program: _____

Third-Year Review Chair/Faculty Member Discussion: _____ (if separate joint dept. discussion): _____
(date) (date)

<u>PROCEDURAL CONFIRMATION</u>	(If joint appointee)		<u>FACULTY MEMBER'S</u>
	<u>CHAIR'S</u> <u>INITIALS</u>	<u>CHAIR'S</u> <u>INITIALS</u>	<u>INITIALS</u>
1. Written unit third-year review procedures were provided by end of his/her second year.	_____	_____	_____
2. Faculty member received information about procedures for requesting a delay of tenure.	_____	_____	_____
3. Progress and expectations concerning research and publications were discussed at the review meeting.	_____	_____	_____
4. Progress and expectations concerning teaching were discussed at the review meeting.	_____	_____	_____
5. Progress and expectations concerning service were discussed at the review meeting.	_____	_____	_____
6. Faculty member received a written copy of his/her third-year review report.	_____	_____	_____
7. Faculty member received up-to-date information about the tenure review process. <i>(It is understood that the third-year review and related discussion are meant as a guide and cannot guarantee promotion to associate professor with tenure.)</i>	_____	_____	_____

FACULTY MEMBER MENTORING

Please list the names of the mentor(s) and provide a brief description of the mentoring plan for this faculty member.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN PREPARATION FOR PROMOTIONAL CONSIDERATION

A. TEACHING:

- Reviewed: No action required
- Plan to assist with teaching development is as follows:

B. RESEARCH & SCHOLARSHIP:

- Reviewed: No action required
- Plan to assist with research and scholarship development is as follows:

C. SERVICE ACTIVITIES:

- Reviewed: No action required
- Plan to assist with service activity development is as follows:

Faculty member is recommended for renewal.

Signature, Chair/Director

Date

Signature, Chair/Director
(for joint appointments)

Date

Signature Faculty Member

Date

Appendix III

CAREER ADVISING FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

It is the hope of the College of LSA that newly hired faculty will receive useful professional advice from their colleagues in the academic community. Career advising, sometimes called mentoring, can take many forms: it may be formal and deliberate or informal and unintentional; it may take place in a group or one-on-one. It includes advice about the substance of teaching and research in the academy, about navigating the academic environment, about work-life balance, and about external measures of success, such as where one publishes. Career advising is an activity that sometimes occurs between and among peers, as well as between and among those with different levels of experience. In an academic community, mentoring is ideally freely sought and freely given among colleagues with different needs for assistance at different career stages (please see http://www.lsa.umich.edu/facstaff/academic_affairs/policies/tenure_tenuretrack_faculty and your departmental career advising/mentoring policy for more information).

COLLEGE SUPPORT FOR CAREER ADVISING

The College of LSA will provide up to a total of \$3500 to each department that appoints a new Assistant Professor. These funds are to be used for Career Advising/Mentoring activities over the course of the Assistant Professor's time at this rank; these include both activities scheduled by the department and, with departmental approval, additional activities identified by the Assistant Professor.

The preparation of a plan and budget for mentoring should be a cooperative activity between each Assistant Professor and the unit. Although the dollar amount will vary by unit, some portion of the available funding will be committed for standard mentoring activities expected to occur in all cases. Assistant Professors who wish to request the remaining funds should prepare a brief proposal (see next page) describing a plan and budget. Although this need not be detailed, it should include a timeline for key activities (e.g., manuscript workshop, proposal submission, etc. as appropriate). Before developing a proposal, Assistant Professors should consult with their chair and their mentor or mentoring committee regarding both the typical and required mentoring activities in the department. Some examples of appropriate expenses include:

- Formal mentoring meetings (for example, over lunch or dinner) with other faculty. These might be organized around a particular subject or issue, e.g., research interests, effective teaching, tenure prep, work-life balance, writing projects, etc., and could be either a peer group or one or more senior mentors
- Costs associated with a manuscript workshop (for Assistant Professors in book fields)
- Editing services to proofread, fine tune, or edit a scholarly manuscript or a research proposal for submission
- Coaching services to improve writing, productivity and/or time management skills
- Modest honoraria to bring relevant scholars to campus for a departmental or interdisciplinary event, such as a book workshop (for book fields) or a working forum (for

article fields), or a panel to review individual research proposals. Note, it is not the intention of the College that these funds should be used to replace funding that would ordinarily be provided by the department

The College recognizes that mentoring plans are likely to evolve through the probationary period and funds may not be spent precisely as originally planned. The Dean's office should be consulted for approval if there are significant variations from the original budget.

After approval by the unit Chair/Director mentoring budget requests should be submitted to the appropriate Divisional Associate Dean for final approval. Requests that have been approved by the Divisional Associate Dean will be forwarded to the Budget and Finance Team. Reimbursement requests should be sent to the appropriate Financial Analyst for funding, once expenses have been incurred.

June, 2010

Appendix IV

Career Advising for Assistant Professors

Submit completed form to LSA Divisional Associate Dean

Name: _____

Department(s): _____

Note: Faculty with joint appointments must work with both departments to develop a single mentoring plan that is appropriate to the expectations of both departments.

Proposed use of funds (500 words or fewer, please):

Budget for departmentally-organized mentoring activities (e.g., junior faculty lunch, book workshop, etc.). This section to be completed by department.

<i>Item</i>	<i>Cost</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
Subtotal	_____

Proposed budget for additional mentoring activities (funding is not available for purchase of equipment or stipends for junior faculty):

<i>Item</i>	<i>Cost</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
Subtotal	_____
Total	_____

I support this request. The requested funds will not replace funding that would otherwise be provided by the department.

 Chair(s) Date

For LSA use only

Approved: _____
Associate Dean Approved dollar total